

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XVIII.

BALTIMORE, MARCH, 1903.

No. 3.

## CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF ENGLISH OPINION OF GERMAN LITERATURE.

GILLIES AND *Blackwood's Magazine*.

### II.

In Vol. I of the *Studien zur vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte* (Berlin, 1901, p. 252 ff.) mention is made for the first time in contributions bearing on this subject of Gillies as an interpreter of German literature. His activity as expressed in *Blackwood's Magazine* is, however, barely touched upon, and what is said of it is unsatisfactory, inasmuch as it is but a repetition of Gillies' own statements (*Memoirs*, II, 263), which, as shown before,<sup>1</sup> are not always reliable. His *Memoirs* state for example<sup>2</sup> (*loc. cit.*) that the "Horae Germanicae" (which were published in *Blackwood's Magazine*) from 1819 to 1827 are all by him, except Goethe's *Faust*<sup>3</sup> and a tragedy of La Motte Fouqué.<sup>4</sup> As a matter of fact the last of the "Horae Germanicae" appeared in August, 1828, and at least six of them were not from his pen, as will be seen presently.

The very first of these studies, entitled *Guilt; A Tragedy by Müllner*, was written by John Gibson Lockhart, as Gillies himself acknowledges elsewhere in his *Memoirs* (II, 248). The second, *The Ancestress* by Grillparzer, based, like the first, on a translation of Gillies, should, I believe, be likewise accredited to Lockhart. At any rate an editorial note seems to indicate that it cannot be by Gillies. "Horae Germanicae XIII,"<sup>5</sup> devoted to a discussion of Schlenkert's *Rudolph von Habs-*

*burg*, is signed S. A.<sup>6</sup> As the other studies bear no signature, or the letters G. or P. K.,<sup>7</sup> it is safe to assume that this one was written not by Gillies, especially as it does not bear the peculiarities of his style. The criticism of Schiller's *Wallenstein*, which forms No. xvi of the "Horae Germanicae," can hardly be attributed to Gillies. It does not seem plausible that he would speak of the excellent translations of Mr. R. P. Gillies (pp. 377-78, *Blackw. Mag.*, Oct. 1823). There may also be some doubt as to his authorship of No. xviii (Sept. 1824) and No. xxi (June, 1825), which contain a discussion of Lessing's *Laocoön*<sup>8</sup> and Wieland's *Aristippus* respectively. Gillies was but little interested in the critical and philosophical writings of Germany. This accounts for the fact that those "Horae Germanicae" that are unquestionably his, deal almost exclusively with the German drama.

As Nos. III and IV, *The 29th of February* by Müllner and *The Cypress Crown* by Caroline de la Motte Fouqué, consist of translations rather than critical remarks,<sup>9</sup> we may turn at once to Müllner's *King Yugurd* (Nos. VI and VII, July-Aug., 1820). Gillies considers this the greatest and most affecting of his works and adds: "Unless we be very greatly mistaken, the skilfulness of Müllner's exposition of the groundwork will sufficiently delight our more critical readers, while the lovers of poetry and passion will find enough of both here to make amends for all they may miss." In the commanding and calculating, crafty and courageous character of Yugurd Gillies suspects

<sup>6</sup> Perhaps Sarah Austin, who was much interested in German literature and occasionally contributed to *Blackwood's*.

<sup>7</sup> Philip Kempferhausen, the name by which Gillies was known to the readers of *Blackwood's*.

<sup>8</sup> Poole's *Index* attributes this to De Quincey. I may say in passing that it names Gillies as the author of all the other "Horae Germanicae."

<sup>9</sup> Of Müllner's piece it is said that there is great sublimity and great beauty in the idea which he has so well illustrated.

<sup>1</sup> *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XVII, 83.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted by Zeiger in *Stud. z. vergl. Litgesch.*

<sup>3</sup> No. V, June, 1820. Cf. Andrew Lang, *Life and Letters of J. G. Lockhart*, 1897, I, 245.

<sup>4</sup> *The Pilgrimage*, No. XII, Aug. 1821.

<sup>5</sup> This is wrongly numbered in *Blackw. Mag.*, as are also Nos. XIV and XXI.

Müllner of having embodied some of his own conceptions concerning the character of Napoleon (p. 413).<sup>10</sup> In the reading of this work Gillies says that he felt as an individual who for the first time in his life finds himself in the heart of the Swiss or Scottish Highlands, in a dark, misty day of October, when every surrounding object, whether living or inanimate, assumes a character new, gigantic, and even supernatural (p. 546). In a discussion of Müllner's *Albaneserin* (Aug. 1822), Gillies claims for this author that no one understands better than he the connection of human passions and emotions with the influences of the outward world; and yet the reviewer is ready to admit that Müllner is inferior to Grillparzer, in whose *Ahnfrau* are some of the noblest examples of pure and concentrative imagination to be found in any author or in any languages (!). If the stage directions were to be left out, the *Albaneserin* would read somewhat like a tragedy of Alfieri! Finally Gillies bids Müllner remember that Schiller never equalled that scene in the *Robbers* wherein Moor, amid wild forest scenery, contemplates and apostrophizes the setting sun.<sup>11</sup>

Seven years before the *Life of Theodor Körner* (translated from the German by G. F. Richardson, 1827) was published in London, Gillies had introduced to the readers of *Blackwood's Magazine* two of Körner's dramas, *Rosamunda* (Oct. 1820) and *Zriny* (Feb. 1821), at a time when the patriot poet was known in France scarcely by name.<sup>12</sup> Gillies was justified in saying: "On our shores the merits of Körner are yet wholly unknown." He believes that his works would have done honor to the most mature and practiced genius. Of *Rosamunda* he says that it is distinguished by its poetical beauty, that it is a most affecting tragedy, admirably adapted to scenic representation. The last scenes of acts III and IV he considers the best in the whole play. The garden scene somehow reminds

<sup>10</sup> A similar suspicion he expresses in his review of *König Ottokar* (see below).

<sup>11</sup> Coleridge said in the preface to his translation of *Wallenstein*: "If we except the scene of the setting sun in the *Robbers*, I know of no part in Schiller's Plays which equals the first scene [now the third] of Act v of *Wallenstein's Tod*."

<sup>12</sup> Cf. V. Rossel, *Histoire des Relations Littéraires entre la France et l'Allemagne*, 1897, p. 216, *et pas.*

him of a highly poetic passage of Mr. Shelley. "We seem vividly to behold around us the fading flowers of summer, that by their touching associations render so much more impressive the expressions of her [Rosamunda's] grief. There is evidenced in these few short speeches of the heroine a stilly mood of resigned meditation and voluntary suffering, accompanied with a visionary and creative sensibility, which no poet has, by the most laborious and artificial efforts, excelled." He thinks that the death-scene in the fourth act is, in some respects, by far the finest in any tragedy, "less horribly impressive than some, but leaving on the mind an influence more lasting and salutary."—The play of *Zriny* he believes admirably adapted to the tumultuous spirit of the times.

In succeeding studies, Gillies briefly characterizes the works of two contemporary authors who have now fallen into well-deserved oblivion: *Darkness*, by Raupach (Jan. 1821) and *The Light Tower*, by Houvald (Jan. 1823). While he criticises Houvald because of his choice of frightful and repelling subjects, he has words of praise and encouragement for Raupach. In his manner he finds, however, more of inconsistency and inequality than he has ever met with in any other German author.

His comments on the next drama, Klingemann's *Faust* (June, 1823), are of greater interest. He makes bold to say that it is in some respects even more truly German than Goethe's *Faust*. Though Klingemann makes no use of scenery, his work is "highly dramatic and admirably suited for the German theatre, insomuch that we do not know any production evincing more of what is technically called stage effect." In the character of Katha, says Gillies, Klingemann has a vantage ground over Goethe.

Schiller, whose *Fiesco* and *Wilhelm Tell* are reviewed in 1824 and 1825, receives boundless praise. Not one of his plays is said to have more "capabilities" of being rendered effective and interesting in another language than the *Conspiracy of Fiesco*. Gillies says of it: "From beginning to end it exhibits a bustle and variety of incident and situation, with a passionate liveliness of dialogue, and strength in the delineation of character, which are truly admirable." Yet "with much energy it combines many faults."

Gillies points out that the catastrophe (especially the accidental death of the heroine, by the hand of her husband) seems exactly calculated to provoke the censures of minor critics. This he thinks could be changed, as also the dialogues regarding the intended fate of Bertha, so as not to prove offensive to the over-fastidious delicacy of English readers. A refacimento of *Fiesco* would be more difficult to make than one of the *Robbers*, which if properly condensed, and wrought down to that level, which is suited to the powers of English actors, and the so-called refined taste of English audiences, would obtain great applause. Through the whole play the character of the Moor, says the critic in the course of his review, is well kept up, and affords one of the best specimens of a mercenary villain that have yet been produced. Scenes 12, 13 and 14 of Act iv Gillies believes to be unrivalled. The first of them, he continues, depends more on the effect of situation than on language; and the character of Julia is, perhaps, too coarsely drawn, but the succeeding dialogue between Fiesco and Leonora has every possible beauty.

Gillies' comments on *Wilhelm Tell* will be of as much interest to readers in 1902 as they were to those of 1825. He maintains that this play is best calculated to be introduced to the knowledge of his countrymen, as one of the best, as most consonant with British taste and feelings. It seems to him that the imitation of Shakespeare in *Wilhelm Tell* is occasionally too obvious to escape the most careless reader. The opening scenes, however, are not at all Shakespearean, but very German. The play as a whole contains "great and numerous beauties but also strange faults."

The critic's remarks on particular scenes may be of especial interest. He says that Attinghausen's exhortations (II, 1) to patriotism, and eulogies of Switzerland, despite their prolixity, are spirited and poetical, and that the Rütli scene (II, 2), though somewhat lengthy, if not strikingly dramatic according to our ideas, is interesting by its fragments of Swiss history, tradition, etc. In the scenes where Rudenz and Bertha appear (III, 2), "much ability is shown, as indeed there is in everything Schiller has written. But this love affair appears to us wholly out of place, and rather more à la Française, than we should have expected

from a real German poet." In the "Apfelschusze-scene" Gillies sees so much power, so deep and so strong an interest that he experienced some difficulty in compelling himself to insert the extraordinary stage-directions, which he thinks elucidate and disfigure it. He expresses his disapprobation of two points: "The first is, the singular fancy of withdrawing the attention alike of the persons upon the stage and of the audience from the chief character at the moment of his achieving his fearful deed; for what cannot be both acted and looked upon ought not to constitute the principal interest in a drama. The second is, the sort of insinuation that Gessler did not intend finally to enforce his command." Regarding this point he goes on to say: "We conceive this to be done for the purpose of rendering Gessler's character more consonant to human nature. But we must observe, that when an act, of however unaccountable barbarity, is taken from history or tradition, the only legitimate mode of reconciling it with general principles, is by assigning rational motives, found in the character or situation of the agent." The reason for a fifth act he attributes to the fact that the underplot is unfinished, inasmuch as nobody knows what has become of Bertha.

The review of Goethe's *Götz von Berlichingen* (Oct. 1824) shows more real insight than the review of almost any other play in this series. Gillies emphasizes its originality and its spirit of energy and recognizes the great art as well as boldness in the selection of the period and of the hero—a period "which had been most frequently decried as made up of nothing but brutal ignorance on the one side, and brutal oppression on the other" (p. 372). He derives from this drama the great lesson that "in spite of all the sneers of philosophers the elements of virtue and excellence were predominant among those who formed the Gothic institutions of Europe; and secondly, that in spite of all the outcry of demagogues, the modern world has been continually and progressively improving in everything that really concerns the wellbeing of men and of societies."

The works of three other authors are discussed in the "Horae Germanicae." Of Werner's *The Twenty-fourth of February* (Apr. 1827) an altogether absurd estimate is given. It has been reserved for Werner, says Gillies, to produce a work

of tremendous and overpowering interest. "The whole tragedy is a chain so curiously wrought, a web so artfully woven, that by leaving out a link or thread, the whole is irreparably injured. Not one speech is superfluous; we have no Balaam to fill up chasms. Every speech tells, and prepares the reader for what is to follow. As long as the German language lives, Werner will be remembered with respect." It should be borne in mind that contemporary German criticism also assigned a very prominent place to the tragedies of this author.

In the review of Uhland's *Ernest, Duke of Suabia* (Feb. 1827), Gillies displays better literary judgment. He prefaces the article with the remark that this drama, one of a boundless stock of historical plays, discountenances the theory that German plays and novels are all very wild and irregular. He regrets that Uhland, this excellent poet, has produced but few dramas, inasmuch as in the management of that now before us, he has evinced very considerable ability. To mention but one excellence of the play: "even after the death of the hero, Uhland has contrived to keep up some interest in the action."

The third and last author, who is spoken of with much gusto, is Grillparzer. His *Sappho* (Apr. 1826), written in very harmonious blank verse, is thought to be more congenial to English feelings than the *Ahnfrau*. As its chief beauties Gillies claims the just conception and delineation of character, the admirable portraiture of the workings of the human heart (exhibited alike in the feminine tenderness and delicacy of Sappho's love as in Phaon's originally mad and dazzled admiration of the celebrated poetess), and lastly the rich vein of poetry adorning and vivifying the whole. As one of the blemishes of the play the reviewer points out the discussion between Rhamnes and the faithless lover, as to whether Sappho will, or will not, be dashed to pieces as she falls against a projecting crag of the rocks from which she flung herself.

*King Ottokar's Prosperity and Death* (Sept. 1827) Gillies considers superior in every dramatic requisite to its predecessors. Though the Germans, as he believes, give the preference to Müllner, he cannot help thinking that Grillparzer is superior to his rival in poetic beauty, and powerful, pro-

found, refined conception of character; equal to him in invention and dramatic skill, and inferior only in correct taste. In this indispensable auxiliary to genius he hopes to see Grillparzer improve greatly. In the play before us he "has restrained the luxuriance of his imagination, adopting a style usually esteemed more dramatic, and something of the quaint but energetic simplicity of the period to which his subject belongs. Indeed, the spirit of the age breathes through the whole tragedy. We suspect he was greatly influenced in the selection of his subject by the opportunity offered of portraying in Ottokar much of the spirit of Napoleon during his intoxication of success." Gillies finds fault with the scene in the second act where "the very solemn state of the Dramatis Personae, somewhat too solemn indeed for the taste of a British audience, is interrupted by the insane Bertha, in a way which, upon the stage, we should esteem actual impiety" (p. 306). Here is "one of those marks of deficient taste from which few German works are altogether exempt."

The last number of the "Horae Germanicae" is devoted to a review of Grillparzer's *The Golden Fleece* (Aug. 1828). This work is considered a more extraordinary performance than *The Ancestress* or *Sappho*. Its chief character, Medea, is throughout admirably conceived, says the critic, and for the most part admirably delineated (p. 300).

The preceding paragraphs have treated of Gillies as a critic; a few words should be added concerning his ability as a translator. His versions do not rank among the best, Walter Scott's estimate of his work notwithstanding.<sup>13</sup> He translates, as a rule, too closely to be idiomatic and poetic at the same time. Occasionally he fails to catch the meaning of a word and then he blunders, of course, most unpardonably. Thus he renders "Ich gehe im Wirtshaus zum Hirsch" (*Götz*), by "I was going to the venison in the inn.; and "Ich soll dir glauben? Ungerathne, zittre!" (*Golden Fleece*), by "I shall believe thee? Tremble, thou unadvised!" Errors of this nature are, however, far from common. Instead of carping at such faults, let us rather remember the useful service Gillies rendered in making the English-speaking

<sup>13</sup> Cf. his *Journal*, Dec. 3, 1825: "Gillies translates extremely well;" and Dec. 15: "Gillies is one of the best translators I know."

public familiar with German literature at a time when his countrymen knew scarcely more than two German authors, Schiller and Goethe, and but one work of each, *The Robbers* and *Werther*.

MAX BATT.

*North Dakota Agricultural College.*

*Pandaemonium germanicum*, BY J. M. R. LENZ.

The only commentary on Lenz's satire *Pandaemonium germanicum* is, as far as I know, the one given by A. Sauer in his edition of the work in the eightieth vol. of Kürschner's *Deutsche Nat. Lit.*. It seems to me, however, that these notes are somewhat incomplete; in the following article I shall, therefore, try to complete them as much as possible. In quoting the *P. g.* I have in view the edition of Sauer; the first number indicates the page; the second, the line.

FIRST ACT.

139, 3: "Der steile Berg."—The conception of a mountain dominates the whole first act. Is it original or borrowed?

The first act, as will be seen later on in detail, is influenced by the five authors: Bodmer, Milton, the writer of *Prometheus*, *Deukalion u. s. R.*, and Chr. H. Schmid. Of course, the idea of a mountain, conceived as the abode of the Muses, is familiar to all connoisseurs of Greek literature; it is, however, probable that Lenz was induced to use the figure by a suggestion from outside. The impulse came to him from the article of Chr. H. Schmid, published November, 1774, in Wieland's *Teutscher Merkur*, titled: "Kritische Nachrichten vom Zustande des deutschen Parnasses." That Lenz was acquainted with the article at the time when he wrote the *P. g.* follows from his epigram to Gotter:

Gotter:

Es wimmelt heutzutag von Sekten  
Auf dem Parnass.

Lenz:

Und von Insekten.

The epigram is first found in a letter to Lavater (April, 1775). Lenz had reason to feel hurt. Schmid's article enumerates the different "Sekten"

of contemporary German poetry and classes Lenz among the followers of Hamann. Lenz took up the subject of a critical review as well as the general conception of a Parnasse, changing it however according to his own views.

To turn to the details of the first act, Schmid's division into different "Sekten" may have caused the first act to be divided into four parts. The last three scenes are called "die Nachahmer" (2), "die Philister" (3), "die Journalisten" (4). The first scene has no title, but it can easily be imagined, that, but for the accusation of utter egotism, Lenz would have called it "die Originale."

The impulse received from Schmid's article was not acted upon before February, 1775. We know that the first scene of the first act was written out before February 20, 1775 (Froitzheim, *Zu Strassburgs St.-u. Drg. Zeit*, 75). That it was not written before February, we can conclude from the similarities with Nicolai's *Freuden des jungen Werthers*, which appeared February, 1775.

In this pamphlet Nicolai writes, apparently referring to Lenz: "Auch sah er . . . dass mehr Stärke des Geistes dazu gehöre . . . als wenn tobende, endlose Leidenschaft ruft, einen jähnen Berg (ohn' Absicht) klettern, durch einen unwegsamen Wald einen Pfad (der zu nichts führt) durcharbeiten, durch Dorn und Hecken."<sup>1</sup> Nicolai also uses the expression "Pandaemonium" ("wie ein klein Teufelchen im Pand.")<sup>2</sup> "Schmeissfliegen,"<sup>3</sup> (cf. *P. g.*, 144, 10).

In *P. g.*, 144, 12 "Sie (Journalisten) bekommen die Gestalt kleiner Jungen und laufen auf dem hohen Berge herum, Hügelein auf Hügelein ab" reminds one of Nicolai's:<sup>4</sup> "Dass ihr Springinsfelde Werther würdet, damit hat's nicht Not, dazu habt 'r'n Zeug nicht." Nicolai speaks of a mountain, which is "jäh," covered by "Dorn und Hecken," which cannot be ascended except by "klettern." Cf. in *P. g.* "steil" (139, 3), "ganz mit Busch überwachsen" (139, 15), "klettern" (139, 20, 140, 6).

Further details of the first act point to an influence of Bodmer's *Noah* upon the *P. g.* There is an apparent resemblance between the first song of *Noah* and the first scene of the first act in *P. g.* on

<sup>1</sup> *D. Nat. Lit.*, vol. 72, 379.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 379.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 367.

<sup>4</sup> *D. Nat. Lit.*, vol. 72, 369.

the one hand, and between the fifth song of *Noah* and the second and fourth scenes of the first act in *P. g.* on the other hand.

What are the contents of the two songs? Briefly these:

In both places the conception of a mountain is predominant. In *Noah*, I., the mountain is represented as the home of the chosen people, while the wicked live in the plain, from which the mountain rises. Noah lives with his family at the base. One day he goes to the people in the plain; since he is long in coming, Japhet, his son, goes up the mountain until he comes to a rock, from which he looks out for his father. He sees a strange crowd in the plain, approaching the mountain. He goes further up and meets three maidens coming down. Conversation ends the first song. In *Noah*, V., the giants of the plain try to take the mountain by assault; they are thrown down. Then they hope to overcome it by means of a balloon, but again without any success.

Have we not here the prototype of our first act: "Japhet = Lenz and Goethe, the giants = Nachahmer and Journalisten, Japhet's look-out = the rock in 139, 26, the three maidens = ein Haufen Fremde" in 142, 1?

The resemblance becomes still more evident if we carry our comparison further.

In *Noah* the mountain is called "paradiesisch" (I., 39), is represented as having "einen hängenden Rand" (I., 101), different "Seiten" (I., 57; cf. also the pyramid-like "Treppe" of the giants in V., 74 ff.), as being surrounded by "furchtbare Klippen" (I., 55) and covered by "Busch," "niederes Gesträuch" (V., 86-87). It affords a splendid view (I., 48), rises in terraces (I., 98 ff.), etc.

In *P. g.* the mountain has also different sides (139, 5, 15, 140, 21). The "Nachahmer" stand at the foot of it on "Feldsteinen" (140, 24). It is "ganz mit Busch überwachsen" (139, 15), rises in terraces (140, 16): "Gehen beide einer anderen Anhöhe zu"), and affords a splendid view (139, 28).

Further analysis in this regard and also such as are illustrative of the relations of the *P. g.* to Milton's *Paradise Lost* and to *Prom. D. u. s. R.* will be given below.

139, 29: Cf. the letter of Luise König to Madame Hess, February 20, 1775: "Es geht ihnen wie dem, der Klopstocken in seiner Höhe

nicht sehen konnte" (Froitzheim, *Zu Strassburgs, u. s. w.*, 75).

140, 12: "Bruder Göthe," "Liebgen," "Lieber," used by Lenz in letters to Goethe (*Sitz. Ber. der Kon. preuss. Ak. d. Wiss.*, XLI., 1901, 35-36.)

140, 18: "die Nachahmer"—Who is referred to? Not Klinger, Wagner or the like, but evidently writers of favorable reviews on Goethe's *Werther*. This follows from a comparison of 140, 20 ff., with *Prometheus*, etc., ll. 123 ff. The passage in *Prometheus* seems to reappear more or less in *P. g.*, and since *Prometheus*, ll. 123 ff., refer to Löwe ("Hamburg. unpart. Korrespondent"), we may infer that he, Heinse and such admirers of Goethe's *Werther* are here in the writer's mind.

140, 19. Cf. *Noah*, I., 57 ff. v., 85 ("Altan").

140, 20 ff.: "Meine werten Herren, wollt ihr's eben so gut haben, dürft nur da herumkommen—denn da—denn da—s' ist gar nit hoch . . . Geht ein jämmerlich Gepurzel an."

Cf. *Prometheus*, ll. 123 ff.:

"Mir scheint der Junge Löwenmut zu haben,  
Nur muss er hübsch auf ebнем Wege traben,  
Dann wird es ihm gewiss gelingen,  
Sich bis an unser Reich heraufschwingen.  
Geht hier wieder ein abscheulich Getös an,  
Fallen allesamt" . . . .

Cf. also *Noah*, V., 136 ff.:

" . . . . Im blinden Gedränge  
Stürzten sie (the giants) über einander, und von den  
ebenen Zinnen  
Über die Stufen und Ecken der Pyramide hinunter."

140, 24: "Feldsteine"—cf. *Noah*, I., 55.

141, 1: "Lorgnette"—cf. *Noah*, V., 528-29.

141, 9: "er ist mir aus dem Gelenk gegangen"—cf. *Noah*, V., 569 ff.

"Gog (one of the giants) ganz ergrimmt, langt mit der  
Hand aus, Noah zu schlagen,  
Aber die Hand ward aller Bewegung des Lebens beraubt,  
Hing in der Luft erstarrt, bis dass sie Noah berührte."

141, 28: "Apoll"—cf. *Wanderers Sturmlied*, ll. 17, 58.

141, 35. Cf. *Noah* I., 85: Japhet perceives from his look-out a strange crowd in the plain:

"Dieses Gewimmel schien ihm wie eines Haufens Ameissen."

141, 36: "Kapriolen"—cf. *Prometheus*, I. 119.

142, 16-17. Here Schubart cannot be meant,

as Sauer seems to suggest. He did not even know, when the *Hofmeister* came out (1774), that Lenz was the author of the drama. Lenz's particular friends in Strassburg were the Actuar Salzmann, Röderer, Haffner, Ott. Ott and Salzmann received portions of Lenz's translation of Plautus, which Lenz communicated to Goethe apparently only later on (*Dram. Nachlass von J. M. R. Lenz*, ed. by Weinhold, p. 10). It is impossible to say whom Lenz has in view. One could even think of Goethe. Cf. the passage in a letter from Lenz to his brother Joh. Christian, Nov. 7, 1774: "Konnt' ich mein edler Bruder! einen bessern Gebrauch von deinem Briefe . . . machen, als dass ich ihn einem zweyten Du . . . meinem Bruder Goethe . . . zuschickte und dein Glück mit ihm theilte? Wie ich denn nichts geheimes für den haben kann" (*Sitz. Ber., u. s. w.*, 26). Cf. also Goethe's account of his relations to Lenz in *D. u. W.*

142, 22: "Lenz an einem einsamen Orte"—cf. Milton's *Par. Lost.* II, 546 ff.:

. . . . . "Others, more mild,  
Retreated in a silent valley, sing  
. . . . . and complain that Fate  
Free Virtue should enthrall to Force or Chance."

The lines 555 ff. in the same passage suggested probably *P. g.* 139, 28 ff.:

. . . . . "In discourse more sweet  
Others apart sat on a hill retired,  
In thoughts more elevate, and reasoned high  
Of Providence, Foreknowledge, Will, and Fate,  
Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute."

143, 5: "herabhängend"—cf. *Noah*, I, 58: "hangender Rand," 68: "mit hochhangenden Gärten;" also *Messias* IV., 1337: "herhangend."

143, 10. Cf. Goethe's poem, *Der unverschämte Gast*, publ. Sept., 1774.

143, 15: "Gelehrtenneide"—cf. *F. v. Hagedorn's poet. Werke*, publ. by J. J. Eschenburg, 4. part, 25:

"Ich habe es oft für eine nicht geringe Glückseligkeit gehalten, dass es niemals mein Beruf gewesen ist, nicht hat sein können, ein Gelehrter zu heißen . . . Dafür habe ich die beruhigende Erlaubniss, bei Spaltungen und Fehden der Gelehrten nichts zu entscheiden."

143, 35: "und Geld machen obenein"—Refers perhaps to the price offered Febr. 28, 1775, by S. C. Ackermann and F. S. Schröder in Hamburg for the best drama (*Deu. Litt. D. d. 18. u. 19. J.*, vol. 32, ix ff.).

144, 10: "wirft ihnen ein Seil zu."—Taken from *Noah* V., 658 ff., where Raphael by divine command spreads a net in order to intercept the balloon of Adramelech.

144, 10-11: "die Journalisten verwandeln sich in Schmeissfliegen und besetzen ihn von oben bis unten"—cf. Nicolai, etc., 367: "Was das für 'n Junge war, der Werther. Gut, edel, stark. Und wie sie 'n verkannt haben. Da kamen die Schmeissfliegen, setzten sich auf 'n."—Cf. also *Prometheus* II, 264-266.

144, 12. Cf. Nicolai, etc., 369.

144, 20-23. Cf. Voss' well-known apostrophe to Klopstock: "Was ist Milton, was ist Virgil und Homer gegen den Messiassänger?"

144, 35: "Strich wider die Natur"—cf. Goethe's poem, *Künstlers Abendlied*.

144, 36 ff.: "die Antwort die der König von Preussen einem gab."—One day when Frederick the Great made a short stay in a provincial town of his kingdom, he was met by the burgomaster, who commenced his address of welcome by saying: "O halber Gott, du grosser Friederich." The king interrupted him by the sarcastic remark: "O ganzer Narr, du kleiner Dieterich," whereby the address was brought to a sudden close. Dieterich was the burgomaster's name (*Characteristic Anecdotes, etc., of Frederick II.*, by B. H. Latrobe, London, 1788, p. 124).

145, 5-6. Cf. *Prometheus*, I, 263.

145, 13: "Verfall der Künste"—cf. Lenz's translation: "Johannes Ludovikus Vives von Verderbniss der Künste," made at Strassburg (*Sitz. Ber., u. s. w.*, 8).

145, 16: "auf allen Vieren"—cf. *Prometheus*, I, 99.

145, 18-19: "Maler der menschlichen Gesellschaft."

"Gemahlde" frequently used by Lenz; so in the title of his *Sizil. Vesper.*, in a letter to Merck (1775), in his *Anmerk. über's Theater* (*Ges. Schriften* II, 207, 216), and elsewhere.

#### SECOND ACT.

The idea of the passing of the poets in review may have been suggested to Lenz by the fourth book of Pope's *Dunciad* and by *Prometheus*, perhaps also by Schmid's article.

146, 2: "Tempel des Ruhms"—cf. *Dunciad*, fourth book. Lenz worked 1780 on a poem, *Der*

*Tempel der Freundschaft* (*Die Sizil. Vesper.*, ed. by Weinhold, 59).

146, 18: "Wenn ihr gute Worte gebt."—This expression was apparently common among the storm-and-stress people. Cf. a letter from J. D. Salzmann to Lenz, June 1776: "Wenn ihr mir gut wort gebt so schick ich's euch" (*Sitz. Ber. u. s. w.*, 29); Nicolai, etc., 368: "spitze Rede geben."

The lines 18–19, although under quotation marks are no quotation; also 149, 5, 12, 164, 31, 158, 31. The quotation marks simply indicate that a new person is speaking.

147, 29: "Ôté la culotte."—Note a similar passage in Rabelais' *La vie de Gar. et de Pant.*, fourth book, XLVII. chapter, where the devil is frightened away by the sight of the denuded figure of an old woman (*Oeuvres de Rabelais*, ed. by Johanneau, Paris 1823, vol. 6, 443–447). It is however possible, that Lenz refers only to the general obscenity of Rabelais' writings, which is made obvious especially in the *Songes Drolatiques de Pantagruel* (*ibid.*, vol. 9). Possibly Lenz was acquainted with the coarse drawings of these songs.—Cf. also *Menalk und Mopseus* in Lenz's *Ges. Schriften* III., 70, 75; *Prometheus*, epilogue.

148, 18: "Der ernsthafte Zirkel."—By that Bodmer and Breitinger are not meant, as Sauer suggests; otherwise Uz would not step forward from their midst, as he does in 148, 19. The line refers to the "honetten Damen und Herrn von gutem Ton" in 148, 8.

157, 21: "Ich will nicht nachzeichnen."—This (also 23–24) shows, that Lenz was acquainted with Herder's fundamental ideas on poetry. Herder draws a sharp distinction between "nachbilden" and "nachahmen." He approves the first, disapproves the second, and maintains that poetry must be rooted in the home and in the nation, not in the thoughts and beliefs of outside peoples.

157, 22: "so stell' ich Euch ein paar Menschen hin, wie Ihr sie da vor Euch seht."—Lenz's conception of what the modern tragedy should be, is expressed in a passage of his *Anmerkungen über's Theater*: "Das Trauerstück bei uns war also nie wie bei den Griechen das Mittel, merkwürdige Begebenheiten auf die Nachwelt zu bringen, sondern merkwürdige Personen" (*Ges. Schriften*, II., 227). He also says on the drama in general (*ibid.*, 212): "Es gehört zehnmal mehr dazu, eine

Figur mit eben der Genauigkeit und Wahrheit darzustellen, mit der das Genie sie erkennt, als zehn Jahre an einem Ideal der Schönheit zu zirkeln."

159, 34: "Fabel"—cf. the chapter "Der Teuffel ist vnsers herr Gots affe" in *Agricolas Sprüch-wörtersammlung* (in *D. Nat. L.*, vol. 24).

We may infer from the preceding this much: Lenz gets his material from all possible sources; his *P. g.* is simply the precipitate of his rather extensive reading. Lenz doesn't show much originality in subject matter, but in arrangement and composition he is not without genius. It seems to me, that because of these merits of form the *P. g.* ranks, it is true, not with Goethe's *Götter, Helden und Wieland*, but certainly with the *Jahrmarktfest zu Plunders weilern* and with *Prometheus D. u. s. R.*

PAUL REIFF.

*University of Wisconsin.*

#### NOTES ON THE SHORTER OLD ENGLISH POEMS.

##### 1. *Wanderer* 77.

The passage *Wanderer* 75–77:

*Svā nū missenlice geond þisne middangeard  
windē biwānne weallas stondað  
hrīme bilihorene, hryðge þā ederas,*

contains a word *hryðge*, not occurring elsewhere, of which the precise meaning is not clear. It has been variously interpreted: 'tottering' (Thorpe); 'zerrüttet' (Grein); 'in ruins' (Sweet, *Diet.*); 'uprooted' (Gollancz); etc. In texts which mark quantities, it has always been given as short.

If we compare ll. 101–105 of the same poem:

*and þās stānleoþu stormas cnyssað;  
hrið hrēosende hrīsan bindeð,  
wintres wōma, þonne won cymeð,  
nīpeð nihtscūa, norþan onsendeð  
hrēo haglfare hæleþum on andan,*

a passage dealing with the same theme as the former, it becomes plain that our word is the adjective formed from *hrið*, *hryðge* (*hriðge*) with long *i*. *Hrið* occurs in Old English only here, but its meaning is clear from the context and from the

Icel. *hrið*, 'storm,' especially 'snow-storm.' *Hrýðge* may therefore be translated 'snow-covered.'

## 2. *Gifts of Men* 93.

In this poem, lines 91–94:

*Sum cræft hafað cirenytta fela;*  
*mæg on lof-songum Lífes Waldend*  
*hlüde hergan; hafað hælīce*  
*beorhte stefne,*

the second *hafað* should be changed to *hefseð*. The copyist has by mistake repeated the *hafað* of two lines above. The verb *hæbban* is not elsewhere found in similar use, whereas *hebba*n is used with *stefne* in *Exod.* 276, *hōf þā for hergum hlüde stefne*; *Exod.* 574, *hōfon hereþréatas hlude stefne*; *Ps.* 92.4, *hōfon heora stefne strēamas*.

## 3. *Seafarer* 69.

This line has already sustained one correction, Grein's *tūd āgā* for MS. *tidege*. The passage involved (68–71), as thus amended, reads:

*Simle þrēora sum, þinga gehwylce,*  
*ter his tūd āgā, tō twēon weorþeð:*  
*ādl oþþe yldo oþþe eeghete*  
*fægum fromweardum feorh oþþringeð.*

Würker has explained that *þinga gehwylce* means 'in any event.' The antecedent of *his* must be supplied from the context, unless we go fourteen lines back to *beorn* (l. 55).

But, like much else in the *Seafarer*, the passage is still obscure. What is meant by *tō twēon weorþeð*? 'Becomes doubtful?' I propose to read *tō tēon weorþeð*, 'becomes his ruin, destroys him.' Compare *Rid.* 51. 3, *þone [the dog] on tēon wigeð fēond his fēonde*, and (for the similar use of a related word) *Blickl. Hom.* 51. 9, *eal hit him wyrð tō tēonan*.

## 4. *Fates of Men* 8.

The lines to be considered are 7–9:

*Fergað swā ond fēdað fæder ond mōðor;*  
*giefað ond gierwað; God āna wāt*  
*hwæt him weazendum winter bringeð.*

The verbs are used with reference to the child (*bearn*, l. 3). Cosijn (*Beitr.* xxii, 125) proposes *frēogað* for *fergað*, certainly an improvement. But, with either reading, the four verbs are not used in a similar manner. If the word *bearn* were expressed it would be the direct object of

three of them, but the indirect object of *giefað*. Rhythmically, also, there is objection to *giefað*, in that its first syllable is short, whereas a perfect balance with *frēogað*, *fēdað*, and *gierwað*, would demand a long first syllable. I suggest *giemað*. Although this word is ordinarily followed by the genitive, Bosworth-Toller cites one instance of its use with the accusative, *Lev.* 26. 41, *ic gýme mīn wedd*. I need hardly dwell on the additional point that *giemað* makes better sense.

## 5–6. *Wonders of Creation*, 85 and 88.

Lines 82–85 of this poem run as follows:

*Forþon swā teofenede sē be teala cūþe,*  
*dæg wið nihte, dēop wið hēan,*  
*lyft wið lagustrēam, lond wið wāge,*  
*flōd wið flōde, fisc wið yðum.*

The expression *flōd wið flōde* is not in harmony with its five accompanying phrases, as it alone does not consist of a pair of opposites. For *flōde*, read *foldan*.

In l. 88, the word *meahthlocum*, ins. pl. of \**meahthloca*, has been overlooked by the lexicographers, and does not appear in any OE. dictionary.

W. STRUNK, JR.

Cornell University.

## CHAUCER'S IDENTICAL RIMES.

An examination of the *Ryme-Index to the Ellesmere ms.* of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, shows that Chaucer used identical rimes with a frequency that can hardly be called "sporadic." In all they number 657, of which two-thirds (447) are such as *recchelees-waterlees*, *tappestere-beggestere*, *fetisly-solempnely*. With these endings, 42 are words in *-tie*, 51 are words in *-nesse*, and 130 are words in *-ly*. There are 123 cases of compounds, such as *served-reserved*, *benefice-office*, *affect-infect*, *lond-Engelond*. In 67 cases the words are identical in sound, but have different meanings, as in *myn armes-god of armes* (64 / 22478). In four cases the words are used as different parts of speech:

*right* n. obj. and adv. 88 / 3090,  
*wight* n. obl. and adj. 264 / 3457,  
*wise* n. obl. and adj. 272 / 3705,  
*wyse* n. obl. and adj. plu. 406 / 116.

In five cases the words are different forms of the same verb :

*caste* 1 s. pres. and 3 s. perf. 62 / 2171,  
*fare* inf. and pp. 70 / 2435,  
*telle* inf. and 1 s. pres. 143 / 411,  
*tolde* 1 s. perf. and 3 s. perf. 158 / 880,  
*lye* v. and inf. 278 / 3898.

And in eleven cases the words are absolutely identical. These instances are :

<i>wey</i>	89 / 3133,
<i>woot</i>	143 / 439,
<i>was</i>	153 / 752,
<i>wyse</i>	155 / 796,
<i>contree</i>	191 / 1908, (in a 7-line stanza).
<i>sente</i>	263 / 3403,
<i>two</i>	270 / 3643, (in an 8-line stanza).
<i>broughte</i>	278 / 3884,
<i>he</i>	278 / 3904,
<i>smale</i>	415 / 382,
<i>reste</i>	439 / 1132.

These eleven clear cases of absolutely identical rime are worth noting because Professor Skeat, in his edition of *The Prioresses Tale*, says (on page 215) : "Chaucer sometimes rimes words which are spelt exactly alike, but only when their meanings differ." And on page LXVIII : "words thus repeated must be used in different senses." I cannot find that he either retracts or modifies this statement in his complete edition of Chaucer.

[It may be worth while to note that *wyse*, which Mr. Cromie quotes as riming with itself in 269 / 3609, occurs only once in that stanza ; and that seven other cases of identical rime in the Ellesmere ms. are changed in Skeat's edition. These are :

53 / 1832	<i>doutelees</i> ,	in Skeat <i>recchelees</i> ,
158 / 910	<i>sone</i> ,	" <i>eft-sone</i> ,
275 / 3788	<i>sone</i> ,	" <i>eft-sone</i> ,
401 / 2278	<i>is</i> ,	" <i>line changed</i> ,
416 / 418	<i>name</i> ,	" <i>fame</i> ,
437 / 1069	<i>supposed</i> ,	" <i>purposed</i> ,
470 / 2234	<i>sette</i> ,	" <i>fette</i> .]

As there are some 8800 rimes in the *Canterbury Tales*, the 657 identical rimes form almost seven and one-half per cent. of the whole number, a percentage, which, so far as I know, is more than twice that found in any modern English poet.

EDWARD P. MORTON.

Indiana University.

#### MODERN FRENCH LITERATURE.

H. SCHNEEGANS, *Molière*. Berlin, 1902, xi, 261 pp.

Professor Schneegans' excellent biography of Molière (which forms the forty-second volume of the well-known series *Geisteshelden*, published by Ernst Hofmann and Co., Berlin) is divided into eight chapters: I. *Kindheit und erste Anfänge*, II. *die Wanderjahre*, III. *die Zeit des Suchens und Tastens*, IV. *Heirat und Schule der Ehe*, V. *die Jahre des Kampfes*, VI. *die trüben Jahre*, VII. *In der Schule der Alten und im Dienste des Königs*, VIII. *das Ende*.

From the short preface the reader may already guess that Professor Schneegans, not content to compile and render intelligible to a vast circle of amateurs and novices the chief results gained by the patient and laborious researches of the last twenty years, intends to represent the great French genius in a new light, firstly, by strictly observing the chronological order (which had been neglected by former biographers), secondly, by assuming a more comprehensive stand-point, from which the originality of the poet might be more clearly discerned than in former days. Professor Schneegans, the well-known scholar and excellent Molière-connoisseur, is indeed fully entitled to express new opinions and thoughts of his own on this subject, though it cannot be denied that the long row of essential discoveries concerning the life and works of Molière appears to have come to a close. In this case, perhaps, the strictly chronological order has its drawbacks. I believe that the juxtaposition of the principal events of the poet's life and comedies of approximately the same date, urged Professor Schneegans more than was necessary to insist on the sombre reflexes which the bright garment of Molière's Muse fatally caught from dreary episodes of his life. Ph. Aug. Becker (*Literaturblatt für germ. u. roman. Philologie*, Februar, 1902) objects to the "zu lyrische Auffassung des Komikers." But who can help falling now and then into the alluring habits of Paul Lindau? Especially with Molière, whose unwise marriage must have now and then galled his wit and humor.

A few trifling remarks may not seem out of place. On p. 4, Professor Schneegans calls the French "leichtsinnig". This severe mode of judging the character of a whole nation reminds me

of a passage of E. Browning's *Aurora Leigh* (sixth book), which I shall certainly not quote here in its full length but which contains a wholesome lecture on the levity with which opinions are handed over till "*the same thing shall pass at last for absolutely wise, and not with fools exclusively.*" And so we say the French are light, as if we said the cat mews or the milch-cow gives us milk.

On p. 70 ff. Professor Schneegans turns our attention to the dismal conditions of the French stage in the seventeenth century. Perhaps the interesting, most accurate description might be enhanced by mentioning the year 1672. On the 16th of October, "la Comtesse d'Escarbagnas" was performed as well as "l'Amour médecin." It was a Sunday, and pages and domestics of the Maréchal de Gramont were busy thrashing a spectator, and pelting the actors with stones; and when Molière entered the stage, they aimed at him part of a large tobacco-pipe. P. 71 reminds me of Musset's ingenious way of explaining difficulties caused to the French classics by the preposterous privileges of the noblemen. In his essay on the "Tragédie" (à propos des débuts de Mlle Rachel), Musset asserts that he perfectly understands why Racine's tragedies appear inanimate to the public of his day.

"Et d'où vient maintenant qu'au théâtre, il faut le dire, les tragédies de Racine, toutes magnifiques qu'elles sont, paraissent froides par instants, et même d'une froideur bizarre, comme de belles statues à demi animées? C'est que le comte de Lauraguais a donné trente mille francs, en 1759, pour qu'on ôtât les banquettes de la scène; c'est qu'Andromaque, Monime, Emilie, sont aujourd'hui toutes seules dans de grands péristyles où rien ne les gêne, où elles peuvent se promener sur une surface de soixante pieds carrés, et les marquis ne sont plus là pour entourer l'actrice, pour dire un bon mot après chaque tirade, pour ramasser l'éventail d'Hermione, ou critiquer les canons de Thésée. Oreste, son épée à la main, n'a plus besoin d'écartier la foule des petits-maîtres et de leur dire: "Messieurs, permettez-moi de passer; je suis obligé d'aller tuer Pyrrhus . . . ."

Why does Don Juan "*hypocrite*" (p. 137) seem rather strange? Hypocrisy belongs to his rôle. Molière's predecessors Dorimond and Villiers furnished some religious mockery, of which the author

of Tartuffe willingly benefited; moreover, real, living "Don Juans" have screened themselves behind religious scruples. I need but quote Henry VIII of England's example, who pretended to feel conscience-stricken after eighteen years of marriage with Catherine of Aragon, his late brother's wife!

For the same reason which makes Professor Schneegans prefer Goethe's "*Gretchen*" to "*Herrische*", I would adjudge the palm to Molière's "*Agnès*". Her letter to Horace (*École des femmes*, III. 4) is an unrivaled masterpiece of virginal purity.

To the list of works and studies on Molière, which forms the appendix and which has already been augmented by Mahrenholz (*Ztschrft. f. rz. u. engl. Unterricht*, Heft I, 1902, pp. 92-93), I but add: van Hamel, *Het Letterkunde Leven van Frankrijk*, Amsterdam, 1898, which contains: Molière's *Don Juan* and *Misanthrope*.

M. J. MINCKWITZ.

München.

#### GERMAN SYNTAX.

*Concerning the Modern German Relatives, "Das" and "Was," in Clauses Dependent upon Substantivized Adjectives.* By STARR WILLARD CUTTING. The Decennial Publications. The University of Chicago Press, 1902. 4to., pp. 111-131.

Professor Cutting, in briefly outlining the history of *was* as a relative, says that "the use of *was*, first as an indefinite and later as an interrogative pronoun, is a common feature of Old High German and Middle High German syntax." This seems to mean that the change from the indefinite to the interrogative function of *was* took place in historic times. Now it is true that in the Indo-European languages the same word generally serves as indefinite and as interrogative pronoun, but there is apparently not sufficient evidence to show which of the two functions *was* the primary one. Theoretically either may be derived from the other (cf. Paul, *Principien*,<sup>3</sup> 121). A glance at the examples in Kelle's and Sievers' Glossaries to *Otfried* and *Tatian* shows how much more often *wer* and *waz* were used as interrogatives than as indefinites even

at that early period in the history of the language.

Nor does it seem to us by any means certain that "the free use of the latter [viz. of *was* (*wer*) as a relative] is derived from the combination of indefinite *waz* (*wer*) with the particle *sō*." Cf. Otfrid I. 27. 52: *thaz sinu uuort gimeinent, uuaz thisu uuerk zeinent*; IV. 22. 2: *thaz er thaz giħorti, uuaz druhlin thes giquāti*; III. 7. 45: *uuaz forasagon zellent, er unz iz zalla*; V. 14. 19 ff.: *uuaz thaz nezzi zeinit, . . . Grēgorius er sp̄nnota iz*; II. 8. 19: *sār sō thaz irskinit, uuaz mihi fōn thir rinit*. It is true that these clauses introduced by *waz* partake somewhat of the nature of indirect questions, but the fact that it is impossible to draw a sharp line between indirect questions and relative clauses would sufficiently account for *waz* being used in both. That Otfrid made no sharp distinction appears from the use of *daz* in II. 9. 87: *firnim in thesa uisun, thaz ich thir zalla bī then sun*, and similar cases. The transition from interrogative to relative is found in many languages that have nothing to correspond to the German *sō wer*, *sō waz*, though it need not be denied that the latter may have helped the transition in German.<sup>1</sup>

The author then points out that the majority of grammarians have defined the spheres of *das* and *was* as relatives only quantitatively. They agree that while *das* was generally used in the eighteenth century when referring to antecedents like *alles*, *etwas*, *das Gute*, *das Beste*, etc., *was* is now preferred, some of them even declaring *das* as now inadmissible. Becker and Blatz, however, recognize a qualitative difference between *das Gute das* and *das Gute was*, and Sanders attributes to the former an individualizing, to the latter a generalizing force.

By means of some 275 examples gathered from

<sup>1</sup> The examples given by Horn (PBB. 22, 220) merely show that in a part of the territory in certain fixed combinations of words intervocalic *sw* passed into *w*. But to explain the modern use of *wer*, *was*, etc., as relatives for the older *swer*, *swaz*, etc. (cf. *Grundr.*<sup>2</sup> I. 724), by such a phonetic tendency without giving due weight to the natural syntactical tendency to use an interrogative as a relative, is like explaining the modern future *wird geben* by the phonetic reduction of final *-nde* or *-nt* to *-n* without taking account of the influence of the more or less synonymous phrases *sol geben*, *muoz geben*, etc.

over seven thousand pages of the prose of Hauptmann, Heyse, Keller, Meyer, Nietzsche, Raabe, Schopenhauer, Spielhagen, Sudermann, and Wildenbruch, the author then shows conclusively that as far as this material is concerned, the traditional view of the grammarians is incorrect. Only after superlatives are the *was*-clauses found to be in the majority; the type *das Beste was* occurs 53 times, the type *das Beste das* 24 times. After antecedents in the positive and comparative degree, on the other hand, the ratio is reversed: 156 *das*-clauses to 41 *was*-clauses.

This result is interesting and valuable beyond the particular point involved: it shows how easily the examination of a reasonable amount of recent German prose may show a traditional statement of the grammars to be incorrect; it confirms what has long been our impression, that a new German grammar should be based less upon its predecessors than upon a complete re-examination of the material. Nor is the value of this chief result of the present investigation likely to be materially affected by some deductions which in our opinion should be made from the figures quoted above, before a new positive statement concerning the present use of *das* and *was* as relatives can safely be formulated.

The inclusion of *alles* and *einzig* in the superlative category seems reasonable, inasmuch as a relative referring to one of these is likely to have the same generalizing sense as after a superlative; but we may ask what the difference is between *das Erste* and *das Zweite* or *das Dritte*, and why the first should be classified with the superlatives, but not the others. The author himself is not quite sure that he is correct in classifying clauses introduced by the relative adverbs *worüber*, *wovon*, and even *wohin*, etc., as *das*-clauses, 15 in all. To our feeling they belong rather among the *was*-clauses. In the spoken language certainly *worauf es ankommt* is equivalent to *auf was es ankommt*.

It seems to us further that the clauses introduced by *dessen* and *dem* can throw no light on the present question, because *wessen* is but rarely, and *wem* never, used in the cases under consideration, so that the relations of *dessen* to *wessen* and *dem* zu *wem* are very different from that of *das* to *was*. As compared with 94 cases of *was* and 22 with *dessen* and *dem*, not a single case of *wessen* or *wem*

is included in the collection. These deductions lessen the ratio of the *das*-clauses to those with *was*, but still leave the former in the majority.

The author also includes among the *das*-clauses all clauses introduced by *welch*. Insofar as it is merely a question of determining the territory of *was*, this seems justifiable; but inasmuch as it is in some degree a question of the gradual restriction of *das*, which was used in the eighteenth century more generally than it is now, the relations between *das* and *welches* should also be considered. We must reckon, for instance, with the fact that not a few persons avoid more or less the use of any form of *der* as a relative after an antecedent that is also a form of *der*, particularly the use of the same word for both antecedent and relative, e. g., *der : der, das : das*, while on the other hand the extent to which *welch* is used, varies not a little with different writers. The issue, therefore, seems to be not wholly one between *was* on the one hand and *das* or *welches* on the other, but from another point of view one between *das* on the one hand and *was* and *welches* on the other. The superlatives, which show such a large preponderance of *was*-clauses, are in nearly every instance preceded by *das* (or *des, dem*); while *alles*, which is classified by the author with the superlatives, but which is not ordinarily accompanied by such a determinative, shows a much smaller proportion of *was*-clauses, namely 3 *was* to 3 *das* (+ 1 *alles das was*). While the total number of such cases presented is too small to warrant a very definite assertion, it seems safe to say that if due allowance were made for the tendencies mentioned, the author's general conclusion, that the qualitative difference between *das* and *was* consists in the more determinative function which the former has assumed since the eighteenth century, is even more generally true than his figures would indicate.

The author promises to make a detailed examination of earlier writers as well as of the living dialects. We suggest that in that case modern prose-writers outside of the realm of philosophy should also be examined to a greater extent than has been done. More than one-half of the material so far examined is taken from Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, which is certainly an amount so disproportionate that it cannot fail to effect the general result by giving undue weight to individual usage,

while on the other hand the most widely read authors, who are most likely to represent and influence general usage, are either not represented at all or only in comparatively small amounts.

H. C. G. VON JAGEMANN.

*Harvard University.*

### SPANISH LITERATURE.

*Estudios de Historia Literaria de España*, por D. EMILIO COTARELO Y MORI, de la Real Academia Española. Tomo I. Madrid, 1901.

The well-known scholar and critic, D. Emilio Cotarelo y Mori has here collected a number of essays on Spanish literature which he had contributed to various journals, and has published them in book form, amplified and improved by his own later investigations and by availing himself of the works of other scholars which have appeared since their original publication. An idea of the importance of these *Studies* may be formed from the following partial list: *El supuesto Libro de las Querellas del Rey d. Alfonso el Sabio*; *El Trovador Garcí-Sánchez de Badajoz*; *Las Imitaciones castellanas del Quijote*; *Juan del Encina y los Orígenes del Teatro Español*; *Lope de Rueda y el Teatro Español de su Tiempo*.

Students of Spanish literature that still had any doubt about the spuriousness of the *Libro de las Querellas* of Alfonso the Wise, will be entirely relieved of them by reading the searching article with which Sr. Cotarelo opens this volume. The genuineness of this work had been questioned long ago by such scholars as Wolf and Ticknor, but no direct evidence was produced by them. Here the subject is examined with a thoroughness that conveys conviction, and the *Libro de las Querellas* is shown to have been a fabrication of that *falsario aragonés*, as Sr. Cotarelo calls D. José Pellicer de Osau y Tovar, a voluminous writer of the seventeenth century, and the friend of Góngora and enemy of Lope de Vega.

In the article on Garcí-Sánchez de Badajoz, which contains some curious information about this mad trobador, Sr. Cotarelo denies that the Sánchez de Badajoz of the *Cancionero General* is

identical with "Badajoz, el Músico," and asserts that the *Músico de la Corte portuguesa*, whose name is Juan, is still a third person. The essays on Juan del Encina and Lope de Rueda are the most important in the volume, as they are also the longest, occupying nearly two hundred pages. Juan del Encina, the first writer of distinction for the Spanish stage, was born in Salamanca in 1468, or perhaps 1469. Nothing is known of his family, and there has been some question even as to his real name. What is certain, Sr. Cotarelo tells us, is that "by the name of Encina he was known, not only here but in Italy, and he never used any other." He studied at the University of his native city the humanities, philosophy and perhaps also theology. At the University he was the protégé of D. Gutierre de Toledo, brother to the second Duke of Alba, into whose service he afterwards, towards the close of 1492, entered.

Encina composed verses at the age of 14, and by the time he was 25 he had written nearly all the lyrical compositions which are found in his *Cancionero*. It was while serving the Duke of Alba at his seat, Alba de Tormes, that he wrote the dramatic pieces which are the foundation of his renown. The first edition of his *Cancionero* was published at Salamanca in 1496. It contained, beside the lyrical poems, eight farces,—*representaciones* two were called,—the others he calls *égloras*.

In December, 1498, Juan del Encina obtained the post of *cantor* in the cathedral of Salamanca, after which he is lost sight of for a long time. He afterwards went to Italy—when is not known—attracted thither, it has been surmised, by the kindness with which Spaniards had been received by popes Calixtus III. and Alexander VI. In Rome he remained several years. He seems to have been back again in Spain in 1509, in which year he was named *arcediano mayor* of the cathedral of Málaga. Juan del Encina made at least three—perhaps four—voyages to Rome: the journey just mentioned, and again in 1512, 1516 and probably also in 1519. While at Rome he was very favorably received, and in 1513 one of his plays—probably *Plácida y Victoriano*, as Menéndez y Pelayo has conjectured—was performed at the house of Cardinal de Alborea, the poet taking part in the representation. The account of this performance is quoted by Sr. Cotarelo from d'An-

cona, *Origini del Teatro italiano*, Vol. II, p. 82. It is not without interest as a picture of the society which at that time filled the palaces of the princes of the church. I quote it here, supplying the omission of Sr. d'Ancona:

"Zovedi a' 6, festa de li tre Re, il sig. Federico . . . si ridusse alle xxiii ore a casa del card. Arborensis, invitato da lui ad una commedia . . . Cenato dunque, si ridussero tutti in una sala, ove si aveva ad rappresentare la commedia; il pred. Rev.<sup>mo</sup> sedendo tra il sig. Federico, posto a man ditta, e lo ambasador di Spagna a man sinistra, et molti vescovi poi a torno, tutti spagnuoli; quella sala era tutta piena de gente, et piu delle due parte erano spagnoli, et piu puttane spagnole vi erano che homini italiani, perchè la commedia fu recitata in lingua castigliana, composta da Joanne de Lenzina, qual intervenne lui ad dir le forze et accidenti di amore: et per quanto dicono spagnoli non fu molto bella, et poco delettò al S. Federico."

(See also Arturo Graf, *Attraverso il Cinquecento*, Torino, 1888, p. 264.)

Encina afterwards went to the Holy Land in the retinue of the Marquis of Tárrifa, and returned to Rome in 1520. According to Gil González Dávila he died in Salamanca, his native city, in 1534, and was buried in the cathedral. Sr. Cotarelo also takes up the various plays of the poet and examines and discusses them at considerable length.

Perhaps the most important essay in the volume is the one on Lope de Rueda. And right at the beginning Sr. Cotarelo calls attention to the fact that the progress that had been made in the secular drama by Bartolomé de Torres Naharro was not continued by his successors, and that a period of stagnation followed in Castile, which lasted, with rare exceptions, until the appearance of Lope de Rueda. There can be no doubt that the *farsas*, *colóquios*, *tragedias*, *comedias* and what else they were called, which were produced for nearly half a century after the appearance of the *Propaladia* of Torres Naharro, marked a distinct step backward. The works of the illustrious *extremeno* seemed to be without influence upon his countrymen. Various reasons have been assigned for this, and they are mentioned by Sr. Cotarelo. One reason is that his works having been written in Italy, they were not generally accessible. But he points out that after the first edition of Naharro at Naples, in 1517, quite a number appeared in other places: at Seville in 1520, 1526, 1533 and 1545;

at Antwerp about 1550, and at Madrid in 1563, 1573, and others. In view of this array of editions it cannot well be maintained that the comedies of Naharro were unknown in Spain. Nor can the fact that they were prohibited by the Holy Office account for it. Sr. Cotarelo believes that the true cause of the lack of popularity of the plays of Torres Naharro is to be found in their very perfection. In other words, having been produced in Italy, where the *comedia* had attained a degree of development unknown in Spain, they could not at once be adopted in the latter country, and besides, the rude state of the appointments and scenic apparatus of traveling companies of players at that time in Spain (we see from the *Prólogo* to Cervantes's *Comedias* that all the effects of such a troupe of players consisted of false beards and a blanket for a curtain) made their representation in the public squares almost impossible. Whatever the true reason may have been, the fact that the theatre in Spain was uninfluenced by the plays of Naharro for a long period, seems undisputed. Lope de Rueda, the founder of the Spanish *comedia*, as Lope de Vega calls him, a native of Seville, and a gold-beater by trade, has the rare distinction of having the greatest of all Spaniards for his biographer, for all that was known of him up to recent times, is what Cervantes says of him in the *prólogo* to his *Comedias* (1615). It is not known when Lope de Rueda was born—perhaps in the first decade of the sixteenth century—nor do we know the date of his death. According to Cervantes, he died in Córdoba, where he was buried in the *iglesia mayor*. By a happy chance his last will was discovered about a year ago, and from it we learn that his father's name was Juan de Rueda, that that of his wife, who survived him, was Angela Rafaela, and that they had an only daughter named Juana, who died at an early age in Córdoba.

The life of the *histriones* in Spain at this time—especially at about the beginning of Lope de Rueda's career—was not an enviable one. Sr. Cotarelo mentions an ordinance of March 9, 1534, issued by D. Carlos and his mother, Da. Juana, concerning the garments and ornaments to be worn by players, which had to be different from those ordinarily worn, in order to distinguish them from other social classes. To stigmatize a particular

class of the community by obliging its members to wear some distinctive garment was a common enough practice in Europe about this time. We know that a few years later, in 1549, by a rescript of Duke Cosimo the *cortigiane* of Florence were obliged to wear a yellow veil, "*a fine che elle sien conosciute dalle donne da bene e di honesta vita*," etc. (Salvatore Bongi, *Il Velo giallo di Tullia d'Aragona*, Firenze, 1886, p. 10). It is recorded that the famous poetess Tullia d'Aragona, who fell under this category, protested against wearing this hateful stigma, and was excused therefrom through the aid of her friend, Benedetto Varchi, the Duke granting the favor because she was a poetess and endorsing her petition with the words: "*Fasseli gratia per poetessa*. (*Ibid.*, p. 12).

So the evil reputation of players in Spain since the time of the *Siete Partidas* of Alfonso the Wise, in which they are denominated *facedores de juegos de escarnio, remedadores*, etc., continued to pursue them. This did not, however, prevent Lope de Rueda from joining a company of strolling players, and in 1554 we find him a full-fledged *autor de comedias*, with a company of his own. Subsequently to this date Sr. Cotarelo prints a number of documents concerning Rueda, one of them dated September, 1561, shows that our author was then in financial difficulties—a complaint as old, apparently, as the profession itself—and that his theatrical wardrobe, "*que no seria muy rico ni abundante*," was attached for a debt of 22 ducats, as he was about to leave with his wife for Valencia, the birthplace by the way, of his wife.

It was in Madrid, then, and about this time, that Cervantes, then a youth of perhaps 14, first saw Lope de Rueda with his company. The date of Rueda's death, as already mentioned, is not exactly known, but he was already dead on October 7, 1566, for that is the date of the *censura* of the posthumous collection of his works published by his friend Joan Timoneda at Valencia in 1567. He probably died not long after March 21, 1565, the date of his last will and testament, made in Córdoba when he was so ill that he was unable to sign his name. The above edition of Lope de Rueda's works consisted of four comedias, two *colóquios pastoriles* and a short dialogue in verse "sobre la invención de las calzas."

Sr. Cotarelo concludes his very interesting essay

with a careful examination of the *comedias*, *colquios*, *pasos*, etc., of Rueda's that have survived, discussing their origin—they are all from Italian sources—and follows this with a careful bibliography, and finally, in an appendix, he describes a hitherto unknown work of our poet, from a manuscript in possession of Sr. Menéndez y Pelayo—a satirical work entitled *Flor de medicina*. Sr. Cotarelo's *Estudios de Historia Literaria de España* is a book of exceeding interest, containing much that is new, and should be read by every student of Spanish literature.

HUGO ALBERT RENNERT.

*University of Pennsylvania.*

#### ROMANCE VERSIFICATION.

*Zur Lateinischen und Romanischen Metrik*, von Professor Dr. FRIEDRICH HANSSEN. Valparaiso: Helfmann, 1901, pp. 80. Separatabdr. Verhdl. Deut. Wissensch. Vereins in Santiago (Chile), iv, S. 345-424.

This investigation deals with the nature and origin of the Classic, that is, metric, rhythmic and Romance syllable-count. We are already indebted to Dr. Hanssen for a valuable article on Spanish and Portuguese Metrics, 1900. The present essay is valuable, not so much on account of any new theories or original views, but on account of the material made accessible to those interested in the origins and relation of Romance versification to Latin poetry of early Christian times.

The author is of the opinion that it is wrong to oppose the accentual metrical system of the *neueren Kulturuölker* to the quantitative of the Greeks and Romans; this has led to confusion and done a great deal of harm. The basis of Romance metrics is syllable-count, hence, *quantitierend*; the essential fact is that both systems have a definite number of *Takteinheiten*, and this holds as well for the later Greek and Latin rhythmical poetry. There is a close relation between the Romance and the metrical system, thus opposing the views of Huemer and others who maintain that "für das Metrum das Quantitätsprincip, für den Rhythmus das Accentuationsprincip in der Verskunst massgebend war."

Starting from this view-point, Dr. Hanssen first discusses in a general way the quantitative and accentual versification, and this part is highly suggestive. Suffice it to mention one point that most verse technicians overlook. The physiological laws or principles of rhythm are everywhere alike, but in some respects they have traveled different roads. The rhythmic feeling is by no means the same everywhere; and in verse-structure habit and education have a greater influence than nature, contrary to general opinion. This point seems of the utmost importance, in the opinion of the writer, to a safe guide and sure appreciation of the relation between the Romance and Classical verse-structure and its development. So much criticism in verse-technique is based entirely on the individual feeling and on an appreciation that necessarily follows therefrom, and which invariably calls forth a different standard of critical measure. And here we venture to say that the reason why German criticism on French verse-technique, especially on the subject of rhythm, in general, is fundamentally wrong, is the fact that the German critic takes a wrong standard, a standard based on a German acoustics and not on a Latin. Not until one is able to thrust aside the individual, inherent feeling is it possible to appreciate different verse principles. From this standpoint Professor Stengel is probably the greatest living verse-technique critic.

In the second chapter, "Beziehungen zwischen Reim und Silbenzählung," the author shows that the difference in rhyme in Latin and Romance is based on the difference of the nature of their syllable-count; many examples of entire poems are given to show the nature and development of verse-division and rhyme.

The chapter "Der Accent in der Spanischen Metrik" is of exceptional value, because so little reliable work has been done in this field.

In the chapter "Der Lateinische Zehnsilbner" one point is especially interesting, outside of the many examples cited, he shows that the paroxytonic and proparoxytonic verse-end was not a *Verwildering*, but eine *Altärtümlichkeit* (p. 45).

Under "Rhythmische Daktylen und Anapäste" the nature of the ictus in the Classical verse is discussed; the author agrees with Bonnet (*Amer. Jour. Philol.*, xix, xx) that verses were to be read

as prose. The ictus, according to Professor Hanssen was not put into the Classical verse through reiteration, but through the rhythmical feeling inherent in man (p. 49).

In the last chapter "Die Gleichsetzung jambischer und trochaischer Reihen im lateinischen Achtsilbner" he illustrates the principle that in Romance metrics the last stressed syllable is used as a *festen Punkt* for syllable-count; in the rhythmic metrical system the last syllable of the verse. The conclusions drawn by the author are the following :

1. The Classic, rhythmic, and Romance metrical systems designate three grades of progressive development ;

2. The rhythmic metrical system has remained in close relation to the Classical ; it imitates prosodic forms, counting syllables ;

3. The rhythmic system has retained the verse accent of the prosodic prototypes ; it remains an open question, whether, and how they were expressed in recitation ;

4. Word-accent and verse-accent are not identical in the Classical and rhythmical systems ; the rhythmical verse-structure has nothing in common with the Germanic accent-system.

Although these points may not seem to contain anything new, yet, there is much valuable information and much suggestive reading in this very scholarly and interesting essay. It must be read and studied, however ; on account of the numerous examples cited, a review will always fall short of any adequate presentation of what has been done.

HUGO P. THIEME.

*University of Michigan.*

#### ENGLISH LITERATURE.

*The Blind Beggar of Bednall Green*, von HENRY CHETTLE und JOHN DAY : nach der Q 1659 in Neudruck : hrsg. von W. BANG. *Materialien zur Kunde des älteren Englischen Dramas*, vol. 1. Louvain, Uystpruyt, 1902. 8vo. pp. x + 80.

The appearance of Professor Bang's *Materialien* calls attention again to the lack of periodicals in English devoted to the study of English literature

and to the debt we owe the various German publications of this class. A publication especially devoted to the early English drama is sure of a hearty welcome, and Professor Bang will receive the thanks of all students of the Elizabethan period.

The *Blind Beggar of Bednall Green*, an edition of which forms the first number of the *Materialien*, is not an important play but offers several points for investigation in connection with the history of the drama and the careers of its authors. In his brief introduction Professor Bang does not dwell on these questions, reserving them for discussion in a forthcoming edition of Chettle's Works. It may be hoped that he will there note the relation of this play to *Look About You* and to Chapman's *Blind Beggar of Alexandria*. The plot of the latter play, first acted in 1596, depends on the many disguises assumed by the blind beggar. In *Look About You*, (published in 1600, first acted 1599?) the complications are similarly caused by the disguises of a hermit and of various people masquerading as the hermit. Similarly, in the *Blind Beggar of Bednall Green* (acted 1600), the main plot deals with the affairs of Lord Momford, the pseudo-blind beggar, who assumes various disguises and thus confounds his enemies. The indebtedness of the play to the two earlier ones, and especially to Chapman's *Blind Beggar of Alexandria*, seems clear. Chapman's *May Day* (acted 1601?) also depends for its action upon several disguises, and perhaps further evidence could be secured for the popularity of comedies abounding in disguises at about the time of the *Beggar of Bednall Green*.

Professor Bang's notes are succinct and careful but rather scanty, and he corrects only a few of the many errors in the original text. Consequently we are left in doubt whether the error be in the first edition or the present one. "Desper-view" (l. 657) is defined with a reference to this passage in *N. E. D.* as 'an indigent man, a poor beggar.' The meaning of 'to hamper' (l. 670) seems to be 'to beat.' (See *N. E. D.*)

Notes and introduction, however, are manifestly of less importance than the text itself which Professor Bang has endeavored to reprint from the first quarto with absolute accuracy. The text has also been collated with the copy of the quarto in

the British Museum and several variations noted. Unfortunately, however, Professor Bang was not able to examine the reprint of the quarto in Bullen's edition of the *Works of Day* (privately printed, London, 1881). This reprint differs in many respects from Professor Bang's, and it does not always correspond with his notes of variations in the British Museum quarto. Without considering punctuation or capitalization, which Mr. Bullen modernizes, I have noted over two hundred variations between the two reprints which are not accounted for in the notes of either. I have not been able to examine a copy of the first quarto and so cannot say how these variations are to be explained. Bullen apparently corrects misprints and occasionally alters spelling without comment, and he is presumably less painstaking than Professor Bang in reproducing the original text; but a large number of the variations seem due to grave faults in editing.

It is not worth while to print the entire list of different readings, but it certainly is a matter of importance to learn whose editions of Elizabethan plays are trustworthy. I give a complete list of the variations which I have noted in the first act and a few of the more important ones in the later acts.

*Bang*, line 1, awfull; *Bullen*, awful. 9, read; Bullen omits. 30, last night late; late last night. 41, *Swiz.*; *Switz.* 43, *Swiz.*; *Switz.* 44, watt; what. 50, suddain; suddaine. 60, for-send; for-fend. 62, any; an. 83, *Beamart*; *Bramart.* 89, *Swiz.*; *Switz.* 90, sall; full. 104, Here; Hear. 124 (stage direction), Landeresse; Launderesse. 125, disgrac'd; disgrac'd. 130, Landress; Laundress. 136, trim'd; trimm'd. 180, ready; ready. 197, tarryed; tarried. 238, bust; must. 243, mony; money. 253, morgage; mortgage. 264, stedfastly; steadfastly. 273, as; so. 281, feign'd; feigned. 294, s. d., *Serv.*; servant. 298, s. d.; Enter Gloster disguised with a Letter; Bullen omits. 329, breaths; breathes. 340, this; his [so Q 1 b; see Bang, p. ix.]. 351, betcer; better. 354, s. d., *Draw*; *Draws.* 378, you to walk; you walk (so Q 1 b). 380, Towu; Town. 384, *Playusey*; *Playnsey.* 389, me; Bullen omits. 407, homesome; homespun, (so Q 1 b). 411, you cheated; you have cheated. 411, bed; abed (so, Q 1 b). 414, evenings; Evenings. 445, kuow;

know. 446, s. d., *Oficers*; *Officers.* 473, bafle; baste. 508, tearms; tearmes. 517, *Westfords*; *Westford.* 517, s. d., *Souldier*; *Soldier.* 522, s. d., *Playnseys*; *Playnsey.* 523, hem; them. 602, abuse; abase. 662, sneaking; speaking. 747, follow me; Bullen omits. 796, bang, hang. 803, I say I have; I say that I have. 891, wee; were. 901, and; &. 1036, mingled; mangled. 1129, with; to. 1138, with; to. 1170, excellent; I, excellent. 1221, I met Mr.; I met with Mr. 1245, and go . . . Stratford; Bullen omits. 1292, from open; from an open. 1308, faults; thoughts. 1314, sayest; snyest. 1316, debts and goods; debts, my goods. 1443, smitten; Bullen omits. 1480, w'od we had; wo'd that we had. 1584, foul; false. 1868, in; with. 2513, and is; 'Tis. 2538, Gill; Gilt. 2595, fisht, fight.

ASHLEY H. THORNDIKE.

*Northwestern University.*

#### SPANISH LITERATURE.

*Poema Del Cid.* Edición anotada por Ramón Menéndez Pidal. Madrid, 1900. 8vo., pp. vi + 113.

The editor has here given us the results of the latest collation of the codex of the *Poema del Cid*, now in the possession of D. Alejandro Pidal y Mon. The present edition is identical with the one of 1898 by the same editor, but gives in the introduction more detailed information regarding the manuscript and its present condition, besides correcting a few more misprints not noted in the 1898 edition.

We have here undoubtedly the most perfect reproduction of the manuscript of the *Poema* that has yet appeared, and as it is not probable that another paleographic edition will be issued for many years to come, a brief account of the editions that have preceded may not be out of place.

Not including the one under consideration, there have been printed four editions based on manuscript authority. Of these the *editio princeps* is the one published in 1779 by Tomas Antonio Sanchez, being Vol. I of his *Colección de poesías castellanas anteriores al siglo XV.* 4 vols. Madrid,

1779-1790. Besides a few foot-notes, the edition of Sanchez contains an introduction describing the manuscript, which at that time was kept at Burgos, remarks on the language, versification and literary value of the *Poema*, and appended is an *Indice de las voces antiquadas y mas oscuras de este poema, que necesitan explicacion*. Sanchez states that in 1596 a certain Juan de Ulibarrez y Leyva made a copy of the manuscript at Burgos. The title of this copy, as cited by Menéndez Pidal, is *Historia del Famoso Cauallero Rodrigo de Bibar, llamado por otro nombre Cid Campeador, sacada de su original por Juan Ruiz de Vilbarri, en Burgos a 20 de Octubre de 1696 años*. Sanchez thus criticizes this copy:

"Un tal Juan Ruyz de Ulibarri y Leyva, sacó una mala copia de este codice, la qual he leido y cotejado con su original. Tenia ya este entonces las mismas faltas de hojas que tiene ahora; y Ulibarri las aumentó en su copia, omitiendo por descuido muchos versos, emendando algunas voces que no entendió, y errando otras que no supo leer. Y no reparando en la raspadura de la fecha, copió la era de 1245 como cosa en que no había duda. En fin sacó una copia de ninguna estimación como lo suelen ser las que después de hechas no se cotejan con sus originales, mayormente si son de letra y cosas antiguas."<sup>1</sup>

This manuscript copy was completely revised by Juan Antonio Pellicer y Pilares in 1792.

In 1864 Florencio Janer published with additions Sanchez' collection of *Poesías castellanas*, being Vol. 57 of Rivadeneyra's *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*. The full title of Janer's work is *Poetas Castellanos anteriores al siglo XV. Colección hecha por Don Tomás Antonio Sanchez, continuada por el excelentísimo Señor Don Pedro José Pidal y considerablemente aumentada, á vista de los códices y manuscritos antiguos, por Don Florencio Janer*. Madrid, 1864. Janer's text of the *Poema* is not only a better reproduction of the codex, but the entire edition is more valuable than that of his predecessor on account of the excellent notes, both historical and critical, which are given at the foot of every page. He reprinted Sanchez' vocabulary without additions or change of definitions.

The next collation of the manuscript was made by Professor K. Vollmöller, who in 1879 published his text entitled: *Poema del Cid. Nach der einzigen*

<sup>1</sup> *Poesías castellanas*, vol. I, p. 228.

*Madrider Handschrift mit Einleitung, Anmerkungen und Glossar neu herausgegeben von Karl Vollmöller. I Theil: Text, Halle, 1879.* It is to be regretted that only the text has been published. It is now out of print.

The last edition preceding Menéndez Pidal's is the one edited by Mr. Archer Huntington, a review of which was given not long ago in the columns of this journal<sup>2</sup> and, as Menéndez Pidal puts it, "no se aparta de la de Vollmöller en ningun punto esencial."

The first reprint of the *Poema* was made in Germany, 1804, being included in Vol. I of the *Biblioteca castellana, portuguesa y provenzal, por Don G. Henrique Schubert*. Altenburg, 1804.<sup>3</sup>

Sanchez' entire collection was reprinted by Ochoa, Paris, 1842. In 1858 was published at Paris a magnificent edition of the *Poema*, by the French savant, M. Damas Hinard: the scope of this work is indicated by its title: *Poème du Cid, texte espagnol accompagné d'une traduction française, de notes, d'un vocabulaire et d'une introduction, par Damas Hinard*. Paris, 1858. Damas Hinard did not make use of the manuscript, although he had seen it, but states (p. LXXII) that he frequently consulted Gayangos in whose possession the codex was at that time. His text follows closely that of Sanchez but has a number of conjectural emendations, many of which have been accepted by later editors. The vocabulary is quite complete, and the notes, critical, historical and geographical, are interesting and instructive. Copies of this edition are now scarce.

An excellent edition was published in 1896 by the Swedish scholar, Lidforss: *Los Cantares de myo Cid, con una introducción y notas por D. Eduardo Lidforss*. Lund, 1896. Lidforss' task was made easier not only by the work of previous editors, but by valuable recent contributions to literature on the Cid, in the various journals of philology.

Menéndez Pidal's edition aims at presenting exactly the present condition of the codex, and to attain this end the editor has used every means at his command. Reagents have been employed

<sup>2</sup> By George G. Brownell, in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 1898.

<sup>3</sup> Cited by Wolf, *Hist. d. l. Literaturas castellana y portuguesa, trad. p. M. de Unamuno, con notas p. M. Menéndez Pelayo*, Madrid. See p. 39, note.

whenever necessary and they seem to have been needed in many instances where the reading has caused no difficulty to previous editors; for example, on *O* beginning l. 283 and *E uos* l. 284, he remarks: "Leido con reactivo: el *E uos* se hizo *y vos* con tinta negra;" l. 2047, M.: *Dixo*, with the note: "Leido con nuevo reactivo;" V.: [Di]xo; but Sanchez and Janer: *Dixo*, without comment. Other similar examples might be cited. Lidforss also notes the apparent deterioration of the codex: "Su estado parece haber empeorado algo después que Sánchez lo publicó, porque éste no demuestra haber encontrado dificultad alguna en su lectura, y ahora, hasta los renglones finales descubiertos ó al menos por primera vez impresos por Janer, ya no se pueden decifrar sino parcialmente."<sup>4</sup>

As Menéndez Pidal informs us, the codex has corrections chargeable to various hands. Some have been made by the copyist in revising the copy. Others are made with different ink and in less elegant handwriting than that of the copyist, but contemporaneous. The rest have been written in the course of the fourteenth, fifteenth and especially the sixteenth century by persons unacquainted with other mss. of the *Poema*, and, being therefore arbitrary, have no value whatever.

In his text Menéndez Pidal has accepted corrections by the copyist and a few by the first corrector. Remaining emendations either by the first corrector or later ones, that seemed justifiable, have been given in the foot-notes. Abbreviations are printed in full, except when there might be some doubt as to their value; for example, *m̄*, or where the reading presented no difficulty; for example, *t̄*. The editor has made no corrections or additions except to mark the punctuation and employing capital letters for proper names. Editions cited are those of Sanchez, Janer and Vollmöller, and the copy of Ulibarri and Pellicer.

The notes are merely textual and give no help to the student beyond explaining ms.-readings. It is difficult to see how a more correct and exact reproduction of the codex could be brought out in print than the present edition, surpassing in minuteness of detail and in the methods employed even that of Vollmöller. However, the student who is just beginning the study of Old Spanish, or who would like to read the *Poema del Cid* as

literature rather than as an exercise in textual criticism, will undoubtedly prefer one of the older annotated editions to either of these last mentioned. To future editors of the *Poema* who have no access to the ms. the present edition will be of inestimable value.

In comparing the edition of Vollmöller with the present one we are surprised at the large number of variant readings. Differences in the two texts occur in at least 265 lines. A careful count including repetitions would make the number considerably larger. It should be remembered, however, that many of Menéndez Pidal's variants are due to the fact above mentioned, that corrections other than those of the copyist himself and the first emendator are not accepted by him. The two editors differ somewhat in the transcription of certain letters. Menéndez Pidal prints *R*, *r*, Vollmöller, *Rr*, *rr* for the double *r* of the codex, e. g., l. 15, M. *Ruy*, V. *Rruy*; l. 19, M. *razon*, V. *rrazon*; they often disagree in the use or omission of cedilla, as in ll. 34, 41, etc.; likewise in the use of tilde, e. g., ll. 113, 279, 305, 1010. The texts of Sanchez and Janer have *sancto*, *-nta*, etc., while V. and M. print *santo*, *-nta*, etc. M. explains that the ms. has *f̄co*, *-f̄ca* and that the *c* is not used where the word is written in full.

One much disputed and doubtful reading, the beginning of line 2788, where V. has "*Mio trapo* [?] *es*," M. "*Mientra* [?] *es*," is thus explained by the latter:

"Muy dudoso, si el copista no tachó las dos últimas letras que puso; *Mie* es seguro, encima no se ve tilde, sólo una *q* chica y parece posterior, de uno que tomó la *M* por *Q*; luego hay espacio de una letra en blanco y sigue *tpa*, *tpo*, acaso *tra*, *tro*, con una *a* sobre la *t*, todo de tinta rojiza, repasado con tinta negra, con la que se sustituyó por una tilde la *a* sobrepuesta."

The closing lines of the *Poema* were partly illegible at the time Professor Vollmöller made his collation, and not wishing to damage the letters yet visible, he used no reagent.<sup>5</sup> His reading is therefore identical with that of Janer. Menéndez Pidal after employing reagents reads the last three lines as follows:

*En era de mill t .C. C xL. v. años . el el Romans*  
*[E]s leydo, dat Nos del vino; si non tenedes dineros, echad*  
*[A]la vnos peños, que bien vos lo dararan sobrelos.*

<sup>4</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 97.

<sup>5</sup> Dozy, *Recherches*, Vol. II, p. 82.

His notes on these lines are of interest with reference to the date of the copy. He tells us that after the second *C* space for another letter is scratched, but the reagent betrays no presence of ink. Menéndez Pidal himself, however, does not seem to attach much importance to this fact, since he dates the codex from the beginning of the fourteenth century. The letters of the concluding lines are poorly written but are contemporaneous with the rest of the codex.

I have selected from the text under consideration and submit as follows a few variants of greater or less importance, considerably different from previous readings, interesting from the fact that they almost invariably represent the original draft of the copyist, and illustrating the editor's principle of excluding all additions by later emendators of the codex:

69: V. *ençeruicio*; M. *ceruicio*. 142: V. *Amos todos tred*; M. *Amos tred*. 280: V. *partir nos tenemos*; M. *partir nos emos*. 293: V. *conio*; M. *coio*; Janer's reading is also *conio*. 1691: V. *coian el campo*; M. *coian el [p]an*. 1898: V. *ello a mereger yo*; M. *el lo merege* (omitting *yo*). 2264: V. *De todas las dueñas e de los hijos dalgo*; M. *Ea todas las dueñas e los hijos dalgo*. 3647: V. *lanças*; M. *amas*.

NILS FLATEN.

*St. Olaf College.*

#### FRENCH LITERATURE.

*Voltaire's Zaire and Epîtres*, edited with introduction and notes by CHARLES A. EGGERT, Ph. D. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1902. 8vo., 53+183 pp.

Curiously enough this famous tragedy by the great master of the eighteenth century had never before been edited in America, and the present edition may therefore be said "to fill a want." Moreover, the careful manner in which both the editor and publishers have done their work will contribute much towards securing for it a favorable reception.

The introduction covering forty-three pages and giving a rapid survey of the literary activity of the eighteenth century in France, a biographical

sketch of the author of *Zaire* and a brief analysis of the tragedy, is neither elaborate nor especially original. Yet there is in it ample material to give the student a fair idea of the poet's personality, life and work. Attention is also called to *Zaire's* resemblance with, or rather difference from Shakespeare's *Othello*, under whose conscious influence Voltaire wrote his masterpiece.

As for the notes, I should call them rather scant. They occupy barely seventeen pages for a hundred and nine pages of text, and contain, on the other hand, a not inconsiderable number of superfluous translations, or at least such as any school dictionary is likely to give. For instance: 944, mon âme étonnée; 1057, hasarder; 1173, sens interdits; 1226, on m'aime; 12 (Lettre à M. de la Roque), sensibilité; 116 (same letter), en présence même. Other notes are somewhat misleading through lack of precision, as: 505, La cendre, of which the editor says that it is used in the singular by poetical license for *les cendres*; this is true in this case referring to the remains of a deceased person, but the ordinary meaning of 'ashes' is *la cendre* as well as *les cendres*; 1587, expiré is said not to be used any longer; it is again true in the present case, but any modern novel is likely to contain this word at least once; 92 ("Epître à Mme la Marquise du Châtelet"), *cagots* is translated by 'bigots,' which in English has a far more comprehensive meaning and is even obsolete in the sense of religious "hypocrite" (see *Century Dictionary*).

Among the expressions or words that needed, in my opinion, a word of explanation I will merely quote the following:

L. 51, encor; 63, essuyer un outrage; 70, faibles appas, compare the singular appât; 77, vos félicités, an unusual plural; 120, de respect et d'effroi, pronounce respek et d'effroi; 129, A la loi musulmane; and 135, à ta loi. The meaning of *loi* here and in various other places is that of *lei* in mediæval French, namely religion, which latter is a word of learned origin; for obvious metrical considerations, *religion* is little used in classic verse; 176, Maîtres du monde entier s'ils l'avaient été d'eux; the *l'* should have been explained and attention called to the cacophony of the second half of the verse; 189, J'atteste ici la gloire, etc., should be translated; 223, mes destins, uncommon

plural for *destin* or *destinée*, neither of which could be used on account of the rhyme; 249, grâces à, generally in the plural in the eighteenth century, but now almost exclusively used in the singular, *grâce à*; 387, Courbé du faix des ans, peculiar use of *du* for *par* or *sous*.

About the notes I should like to make the following remarks:

L. 119, Cette croix, je l'avoue, a souvent malgré moi  
Saisi mon cœur surpris de respect et d'effroi.

The editor states that the construction is "inevitably amphibological unless changed." But it is obvious that *surpris* is a mere *cheville* and that *respect* and *effroi* are dependent on *a...saisi* and not on *surpris*. The cesura, compulsory in the classic alexandrine, makes this perfectly clear.

L. 484. To *legers* rhyming with *fers* it is remarked that "this is only for the eye, a practice disconcerted by Voltaire." The rhyme is, however, both for the eye and ear and the pronunciation was *légère*. Cf. Nyrop, *Grammaire historique*, sec. 172: "A côté de la forme ordinaire en -é(r) on a conservé -èr jusqu'à nos jours dans les rimes et dans le discours soutenu."

L. 714. De la féconde Egypte il menace les bords. *Bords* is rendered by *frontières*, whereas *shores* is the meaning. We could not very well speak of *les bords de la Suisse*, for instance.

L. 772. Toucher à. The note is misleading. It says: "Toucher à = to be on the point of touching; without the preposition *toucher* is exactly *touch*." But does not *toucher à* also mean 'to touch', for example, *n'y touchez pas*, sc. with the hands.

L. 1395. Vous la verrez sans doute avec indifférence  
Sans que le repentir succède à la vengeance,  
*Sans que l'amour sur vous en repousse les traits.*

The last line is translated "discharge his shafts upon you again, that is, subject you again to her charms," and the editor adds: "ses traits would be expected."

The fact of the matter is that the line is as obscure as possible; even replacing *les* by *ses* the sense would hardly be improved. Personally I would prefer making *en* refer to *repentir* and would take *traits* in the sense of *aiguillons*, sc. *du repentir*, which, I admit, does not entirely satisfy me. At any rate, attention should be

called to this obscurity, which is not much less than *galimatias*.

L. 67. ("Epître à Mme. la Marquise du Châtelet.") Under *Régent*, Philippe d'Orléans is said to have been regent during the minority of Louis XIV; it should, of course, be Louis XV.

L. 24. ("Epître à M. de Formont.") *Notre René* is explained merely by "René Descartes." A short biographical note would be desirable.

The work is remarkably free from misprints; the text is clear and in all other respects the book is got up tastefully and substantially. I have noticed only the following errors: l. 1369, n'eût for n'eut; l. 1509, extrême for extreme; l. 1086, note, thirteen for thirteenth.

In the introduction, p. 50, ll. 29 ff., leave the reader under the impression that a passage has been cut out and the connection thus broken. *Vice* does not refer to anything preceding.

Dr. Eggert has had an excellent idea in incorporating in his book four letters in prose and two *épîtres* in verse, written or dedicated to some of the poet's acquaintances. They contain in brief Voltaire's views about the requirements, qualities and defects of the tragic stage in France and in England and a few details about the play here discussed, all in his graceful, easy epistolary style, far more effective to convey information to young minds than rules or maxims.

On the whole, the edition before us is a good piece of work and one that will be welcomed by all teachers of French.

J. L. BORGERHOFF.

*University of Chicago.*

#### OLD FRENCH CUSTOMS.

*Beiträge zu den Bildern aus dem altfranzösischen Volksleben auf Grund der "Miracles de Nostre Dame par personnages," von FRIEDRICH MORITZ FORKERT.* Heidelberg dissertation. Bonn, 1901.

This work is thus divided: *Teil I. Das Gläubensleben.* 1. The Old and the New Testament. 2. The New Testament. 3. Belief in the Trinity. 4. The Angels. 5. Mary, the Mother of God and the Mary cultus. 6. The saints. 7. The devils. 8. Heaven or Paradise. 9. Purgatory. 10. Hell.

11. Miracles and belief in miracles. *Teil II.*  
*Kirchliches Leben.* 1. The church. 2. The clergy.  
 3. Functions of the church. 4. Hermits. 5.  
 Martyrs. 6. Justification by good works.

The writer promises to treat secular life in Part III and then to publish the three parts as a book. The importance of such contributions to the study of the life of the Middle Ages can readily be seen. It is only through the aid of special investigations of this character that a comprehensive and accurate history of medieval life can be written.

The *Miracles of Notre Dame* have been already rather fully treated by Petit de Julleville in his very readable work, *Les Mystères* (Paris, 1880). An up-to-date summary of the subject by Gröber may be found in his *Grundriss der Romanischen Philologie* (II. Band, I. Abt., pp. 1204-1218) under the heading: *Marienmirakel*. Forkert's dissertation, limited to a special phase of the subject, contains much material of value. It is written in a facile and readable style. The conclusions for the most part seem sound. In the Introduction, Forkert qualifies the reliability of the *Miracles* as a historical document reflecting the life of the time. He fully realizes that the allusions, the remote sources and the supernatural, formal and conventional elements often render the interpretation of the material difficult. We may remark, however, that the men of the Middle Ages depicted past centuries with the coloring of their own time. Forkert says (p. 4):

"Wenn die Annahme richtig ist, dass die Miracles ihre Entstehung oder ihre Zusammenstellung derselben Hand verdanken, was umso wahrscheinlicher dadurch wird, dass dieselben Anschauungen in derselben Einkleidung immer wiederkehren, so verringert sich ihre Bedeutung für die Kenntniss der Kultur jener Zeit noch mehr."

Gröber (*op. cit.*, p. 1215) says:

"Auf speziellere Unterschiede und Uebereinstimmungen ist Verschiedenheit oder Gleichheit der Verfasser nicht zu gründen. Fast alle Kriterien dafür versagen. Die Benutzung z. B. derselben erfundenen Namen in verschiedenen Stücken kann auf Entlehnung beruhen, die sich der jüngere Dichter gegenüber einem älteren erlaubte. Die Anwendung desselben Rondeaus oder Rondeaurain in mehreren Dramen ist ebensowenig eine Anzeige desselben Verfassers."

On page 27, Forkert says:

"Maria nennt Christus ihren Vater, ihren Sohn

und ihren Gemahl, und Christus selbst bezeichnet sich als Sohn, Bruder, Freund, Gemahl, und Vater der Maria. Mir. 8, 659-60. *Mon pere, mon fil, mon espoux.* Mir. 32, 442-43. *Qui sui de ma fille et ma mere fils, frere, ami, espoux et pere.* Dr. Schröder in seinem Buch *Glaube und Aberglaube in den Altfranzösischen Dichtungen*, S. 13, Anm. 1, erblickt darin eine Spielerei. Vielleicht lassen sich derartige Bezeichnungen als Ueberschwänglichkeiten charakterisieren, die eine Folge des übertriebenen Marienkultus sind."

This is rather a naïve mode of expressing intimate relation and protection. Compare Homer's Iliad, 6, 429-30, where Andromache says to Hector at parting: "Hector, thou art my father and potent mother, yea and brother even as thou art my goodly husband." The dissertation contains many interesting details. The misprints seem altogether too numerous in the extracts from the *Miracles*.

TIMOTHY CLORAN.

Vanderbilt University.

#### GERMAN LITERATURE.

*Schillers Einfluss auf Grillparzer.* Eine litteratur-historische Studie von O. E. LESSING. A Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Michigan, 1901. (= *Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin*, No. 54. Philology and Literature Series, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 77-204. Madison, Wisc., 1902.)

The author of this thesis treats in a thorough manner Grillparzer's conception and opinion of Schiller and the influence of the latter upon the dramatic writings of Grillparzer. But the investigation is not yet complete, as it is limited to the dramas from *Blanka* to *Sappho*; a treatise of the others and of the lyrics being promised for the near future.

In his first chapter Dr. Lessing treats Grillparzer's personal attitude toward Schiller, using for this purpose all obtainable utterances ever made by the Austrian poet about his predecessor. Apparently it was not the author's intention to show the development of this very peculiar attitude, but rather to bring out the affinities or differences of the literary and aesthetic views of the two poets. Yet we find that Grillparzer's

views of Schiller had undergone various changes. His utterances are first full of admiration for Schiller, later, in the years of *die Ahnfrau* and *Sappho*, he shows very little appreciation for the poet of *Tell*, and only with the advance of his career he seems to comprehend the great German classic better. In order to understand these changes and to find reasons for them, Grillparzer's views in regard to Schiller, should be, first of all, considered in chronological order. The following lines will attempt to explain briefly this development.

It was at first a mere youthful enthusiasm for Schiller, which filled the soul of the young Austrian poet. Schiller is so dear to him that he recommends him to his friends and acquaintances [Jahrb. III. p. 108]. While writing *Blanka* and the comedy, *die Schreibfeder*, while beginning *Robert von der Normandie* and *Spartakus*, he looks upon Schiller as his model, he still considers him the only really great poet. He has given little time, so far, to Lessing and Goethe or Shakespeare, he hardly knows the Spanish poets, whom he later admires so much. But his play-writing does not meet with the success for which he longed so eagerly. This disappointment forces him to look for reasons of his failure. Schiller, the master, whom he had almost copied, could evidently not be the model whom it was worth his while to follow. He loses faith in his former master entirely, and we find our author in a struggle to gain a clear account of his attitude toward Schiller [Jahrb. III. pp. 130, 134]. In those days Grillparzer begins to study Goethe, whose style and artistic conception he finds entirely different and more pleasing than those of Schiller [Jahrbuch III. pp. 127-9]. While reading *Goetz, Werther, Faust* he shapes his own dramatic principles and forms his ideas of art more clearly. Thus the former admirer of Schiller becomes his opponent and is in his attacks so bitter that he himself feels that his opposition may be looked upon as mere partiality, 'blosse Parteilichkeit.' Only gradually does he recognize the reason for which he turns against Schiller. He feels an impulse, as he expresses it, to make his play-writing the exponent of the pure and unhidden truth and not to carry into it 'irgend etwas Lehr- oder Reflexionsmässiges.'

This is the sentiment which prevails in Grillparzer's notes and statements until 1812. Little

do we know of his development as a poet until 1816. During this time he has given up the study of law; he was tutor for about two years, a period during which his poetic endeavors are not stimulated but rather oppressed. Later he enters into the service of the Royal library and from there, soon afterwards, of the treasury department. The peculiar and rather narrow education which he had received, the death of his father, and the poverty, with all its gloom, which falls afterwards upon his family, the tiresome spirit in Count Seilern's home, his unsuccessful attempts to support his needy family—all this leaves a stamp upon his character and marks the condition of his mental mood in later years. These experiences influence most prominently the next work of his pen, *die Ahnfrau*, in 1817. This drama means to him the first success on the stage and a second one soon follows, when *Sappho* is received with great applause by large audiences of the *Burgtheater* in the following year. Both plays show a marked progress, and the fruits of eager study since the days of *Blanka*, but to no small extent do they also prove that the poet has not freed himself, as he thought, from the influence of his former ideal, Schiller. At this time, again, his criticisms of other works and authors run freely and frequently into his notes and letters, and not a few of them deal with Schiller and his theories. But all his estimates of the great classic prove that his principles have become fixed in the course of time and by the experience which he had by the recent success of his art; as Dr. Lessing says (p. 86): 'with increasing maturity his boyish hatred changes into the respect more proper to Schiller.' Nevertheless we cannot well deny that his humor, so frequently mixed with bitter satire, bursts forth here and there in almost unjust and incorrect statements about his predecessor. 'Schiller hatte in den Stücken von *Don Carlos* mehr Charakteristik entwickelt z. B. im alten Miller, Fiesco, Mohren als später;' with these words Foglar reports a remark made during a conversation (Dr. L., p. 90). There are not many, certainly, who would concur in this estimate; it seems rather to be universally admitted that *Tell* and even the *Demetrius*-fragment are superior in that respect. A similar bold statement we find in a note of 1822 (Works, vol. 18, p. 73): "Schiller's greatest mis-

take is evidently, that he too often speaks himself instead of letting his characters speak." But, naïve as he often is, he admits that he almost criticizes himself by such a remark; and therefore he adds: 'Übrigens ist darin leichter tadeln als besser, machen.' In fact he had found himself guilty of this same mistake several years before—if it is a mistake at all—when he says, 1818 (Works, vol. 18, p. 173), that *die Ahnfrau* was most effective because the sentiment, expressed in it, is in many places much more that of the poet than that of the acting characters. Still, these are only two of the few passages where he, as stated before, attacks Schiller with more or less good reason; several sound and well founded criticisms on Schiller, as made during these years, one may find well enumerated in the thesis before us.

With his next production Grillparzer seems to have left Schiller's path entirely; for the latter has very little effect upon *das goldene Vlies* which stands preëminently under the sign of the classics of antiquity. Only for the plan of the drama, as a trilogy, *Wallenstein* was surely the poet's model, and as motto for the whole plot the first page of the manuscript shows Schiller's words: 'Das eben ist der Fluch der bösen That, dass sie, fortzeugend, Böses muss gebären.'—Dr. Lessing, characterizing Grillparzer's attitude during the following years, says (p. 86): 'In seinem Urteil wie in seinem Schaffen ist er Schiller bei aller Nacheiferung vom goldenen Vliess an unabhängig und des eignen Wertes bewusst gegenübergestanden.' Of course one cannot say that Grillparzer ever becomes again dependent upon Schiller, but as to his course in the following years, especially with his next play, *König Ottokar*, Dr. Lessing himself must admit (p. 91) that 'Grillparzer made Schiller's theories concerning the treatment of historical material entirely his own.' This shows that he clings to Schiller even after the time just named; but this term may not be sufficient. 'He returns,' says Sauer (Grillp. Works, vol. I. p. 49) more graphically, 'to the dramatic technique of Schiller which he had given up more or less since the time of *die Ahnfrau*. He attains grand effects in concentration of actions, extending over long intervals of time; he is as successful in scenes showing throngs of people on the stage, as Schiller is in *Wallenstein* and *Demetrius*.' Moreover Ehrhardt, in his bi-

ography of Grillparzer, points out in several places how strong Schiller's influence has been precisely during this period of the former's historic dramas. That our poet again follows Schiller's footsteps must naturally have a different explanation from that which his former imitation needs. It is because he finds himself more than he formerly acknowledged in agreement with Schiller's views, as just mentioned concerning the treatment of historical material, or the relation of history and poetry in the drama, the conception of nature, the idealizing of characters, etc. (Thesis, p. 92). It is no longer an attitude, marked by certain prejudices, but he looks upon Schiller, since the time of *Ottokar*, as the poet, who, surpassed only by Goethe, is the highest type of a real poet and, therefore, will always be mentioned at the same time with his illustrious contemporary. He upheld Schiller's merits, especially when the 'Junge Deutschland' proclaimed with blatant clamor that it considered itself to be called to outdo Goethe and Schiller. It was meant for this 'Junge Deutschland,' when Grillparzer later, frankly said that Schiller would and should be imitated, as he is the model for every poet who still considers it worth while to follow an ideal. 'I myself was the first one,' so he continues, 'who acted according to this principle.' (Works, vol. 18, p. 53.)

But Schiller's influence did not stop with *Ottokar*, we find it also in *des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen*, a subject treated by Schiller in his ballad: *Hero and Leander*. And then, almost twenty years later, before our poet lays his pen aside, he proves once more in *Ein Bruderzwist im Hause Habsburg*, how willing he is, even in the days of his old age, to be taught by a master like Schiller (cf. Ehrhardt, pp. 279 and 387). It is true we need not deny that we find, now and then, a line even from these later years, which proves that he does not always show the same high appreciation of Schiller. But in considering these remarks we must not forget that at this time it had become a habit with the poet, who felt himself so unjustly treated and who had therefore retired from the world into the narrow surroundings of his study, there to burst forth in the most bitter irony, by which he sought to free himself of the disgust, which he had for his time. This view must chiefly guide the interpreter of passages of the kind men-

tioned above; the context also and the reason for them should not be left out of sight, especially with regard to his fragmentary note (Works, vol. 18, p. 51): 'Schiller wurde der Lieblingsdichter des Volkes. Gewiss, weil dieses auf das Wie nicht so sehr zu achten pflegt.' Dr. Lessing regards this as a sneering remark. This it certainly is, but according to the context one may consider the sneer of the poet as chiefly directed against the public of his time that has misinterpreted not only Grillparzer, but also a poet like Schiller. As a general summary of Grillparzer's view, and as the prevailing opinion which he had of Schiller in the days of his advanced age, we may quote the words which he wrote several days before the Schiller jubilee in 1859 (Works, vol. 18, p. 75): 'Was die Feier betrifft, so kann über meine Gesinnung für Schiller kein Zweifel sein. Ich habe ihn immer durch die That geehrt, indem ich immer seinen Weg gegangen bin. Wenn ich nicht Schiller für einen grossen Dichter hielte, müsste ich mich selbst für gar keinen halten.'

This expresses in words so plain that they cannot be easily misunderstood his own attitude toward Schiller and of what great importance his noble predecessor was to him. But of what value Schiller is to the German nation as a whole, he expressed (vol. 18, p. 74) in simple but significant words when, writing in 1855 to the 'Schiller-Verein' in Leipzig, he says:

'Goethe mag ein grösserer Dichter sein und ist es wohl auch. Schiller aber ist ein grösseres Besitztum der Nation, die starke und erhebende Eindrücke braucht, Herzensbegeisterung in einer an Missbrauch des Geistes kränkelnden Zeit. Er ist nicht zum Volke herabgestiegen, sondern hat sich dahin gestellt, wo es auch dem Volke möglich wird zu ihm hinauf zu gelangen.'

In concluding this survey we may say that Grillparzer's attitude toward Schiller was not an exceptional one; though his admiration for him was not equally strong at all times, he nevertheless accords to him the rank and place that belongs to him; that is, next to Goethe. With a clear and precise judgment he approaches him; wherever he finds him, according to his conception, on the wrong path, he does not hesitate to express his disapproval; but he is equally ready to acknowledge his enormous merits and even 'to walk in his footsteps' whenever he believes that his great pre-

decessor's way was the right and the only one to follow. How far he found his own view regarding questions of dramatic technique and aesthetic doctrines in accord with those of Schiller, is distinctly brought out in the first chapter of the Thesis before us.

In his second chapter Dr. Lessing investigates Schiller's influence upon *Blanka*, and from this discussion we cannot help gaining the impression that Grillparzer has committed an obvious plagiarism. There is probably no means of justifying this action; but it may not be an idle undertaking to explain as much as possible how it could happen that Grillparzer, standing later so firmly on his own convictions, is at the outset found really copying some one else. Let us consider for a moment his mental disposition at that time. As a young, inexperienced beginner, he was spell-bound by the strong impression which Schiller's rhetorical and yet effective style made upon him. Several years later he defines that state of mind (*Jahrb.*, III. p. 129) by saying: 'I read Schiller and at the same time wrote my drama *Blanka*: and it never came into my mind to doubt its eminent excellence or my own extraordinary poetic talent; for Schiller was my idol and my model, and my feeling (perhaps rather my vanity) told me that I was well on the way toward overtaking him.' And thirty-six years later he by no means tries to conceal the mistake of his youth; for in his autobiography (Works, vol. 19, p. 38) he frankly repeats the thought of his diary: 'It took me a pretty long time to finish *Blanka* and while writing it I had always *Don Carlos* in mind.' Besides these passages we may also take into consideration those which dwell particularly on his mental disposition at that time. 'My zeal to imitate,' he says in his diary, 'surpasses all conception. All my ideas are shaping themselves according to something recently read.' It is essential that this mental habit does not remain with the poet. Eleven years later he expresses himself altogether differently about the strength of his memory. 'I am often reading without the least attention,' he says (*Jahrb.*, III. p. 143): 'and forget easily what I have read.' This weakness then becomes so apparent that he intends to aid his memory by a note-book. If we keep in mind that all these statements are diary-notes and,

therefore, not intended to be a vindication before the public, we may be permitted to form the following conclusion from these personal remarks: At the time when he wrote *Blanka*, his memory was to so great an extent the chief factor of his mental equipment, that much of what he read remained almost literally in his mind and was later reproduced wherever there was an opportunity to do so. As far as this peculiarity is concerned, our poet's case is not at all an extraordinary one. As he at that time was especially full of enthusiasm for Schiller and eagerly read his works, he adapts many ideas from him which later almost involuntarily find their way into his own writings. At the same time his mind must have worked with a certain amount of elasticity for, though he found it a difficult task to bring the plot to an appropriate outcome, he nevertheless expresses, several years later, a longing for 'that spirit which flowed in such liberal measure into his drama *Blanka*' (*Jahrb.*, III. p. 130.) When we take his state of mind into consideration, it surely must furnish us to some degree an explanation for the great similarity between *Blanka* and *Don Carlos*.

That this resemblance extends not only to certain passages but also to the general arrangement of the plot and of the scenes, Dr. Lessing has shown very elaborately. To the many passages which he places opposite one another in order to prove Schiller's influence, I wish to add at least one, which seems to me a case of very obvious imitation. *Blanka* Act III. scene 3 and 4 can be easily compared with *Carlos* II. 11–13 in the following way: *Blanka* III. 3: Haro, Rodrigo; the plan of Fedriko's ruin is laid out.—*Carlos* II. 10 Alba, Domingo; the plan of *Carlos'* ruin is mentioned.—*Blanka* III. 4: the king, Maria, Haro, Rodrigo; Fedriko's love for Maria is discovered—*Carlos* II. 11–13 Eboli, Domingo, Alba; *Carlos'* love for the queen is discovered.—Striking is also the way in which a change of the action is brought about in *Blanka* III. 3 and *Carlos* II. 7: 'Still, ich höre kommen,' says Eboli before the prince enters, and the same words Haro uses at the approach of the king.

But in some places of the Thesis, where Dr. Lessing sets a passage of Schiller over against one of Grillparzer, one cannot very easily see the point of comparison that is supposed to lie in such

quotations. For instance, it is stated in the Thesis (p. 109) that Blanka's description of nature (Works, vol. 10, p. 30) resembles some words of King Charles in *die Jungfrau von Orleans*. Now, Charles' admiration for the nature of the country, of which he speaks in that place, expresses itself in sensual terms and he dreams of a spot where he can escape the burdens of his royal duty and satisfy his low desires, while Blanka remembers France and the peaceful, pastoral surroundings of her home as standing in great contrast to her present environment, full of vice and treachery. In the first case the motive is the most frivolous indifference, in the second it is a longing to flee from the threatening catastrophe into the refuge of her home. One may have similar doubts concerning the quotations on page 111 and, most of all, in regard to the remark on the same page:

'Wie Thekla gegen die Gräfin Terzky so macht Blanka gegen Jaqueline das Recht der freien Herzenswahl geltend.—Weder Thekla noch Blanka fragen nach dem Stand der Geliebten; beide fühlen sich emporgehoben und besieglt durch die Liebe, die nichts sucht als Gegenliebe.'

If the passage in *Blanka* permits such an interpretation I think the first of the two ideas is so very common in literature in general that we need not necessarily trace it back to Schiller's *Wallenstein*. Still, Dr. Lessing is by no means blind to Grillparzer's own achievement and points out in various places where one can notice the poet's individual work. We must admit that Grillparzer is remarkably independent in developing his characters; with what success we can hardly discuss here; but in general the strength and the weakness of his talents as a dramaturgist are foreshadowed in this first piece of his dramatic poetry. The male characters in *Blanka* are surely not presented very happily; he cannot bring before our minds in sharp, distinct contour men like Marquis Posa, Alba, or Wallenstein. But types of women like Hero, Sappho, or Libussa show his ability in analyzing woman's character; and here in *Blanka* we find the first sign of this strength, so fully developed later. When Ehrhardt, with special regard to Maria, says (Biogr., p. 195): 'The disciple is like his master, especially unfortunate in the delineation of female characters,' he certainly does Grillparzer a great wrong. Though the poet

admits himself (Works, vol. 18, p. 166) that it was difficult for him to gain a clear conception of the character of Maria Padilla, she is nevertheless, compared with other delineations, unique and the best outlined figure of the play. As the mistress of the king, she represents thoroughly a woman of her kind. Grillparzer shows her in all the passion, and unscrupulous enterprises of that type of womanhood, thus creating scenes almost as full of dramatic fervor as some of his later plays. What relation she holds to the other persons of the cast and of what importance this is to the whole play, is graphically shown by Sauer (Grillp. Works, vol. I. p. 28).

So much for *Blanka*. In a third chapter Dr. Lessing treats the fragments of 1810-1813 and their relation to Schiller. Among other things he says about the torso *Spartacus*: 'ohne *Fiesco*, *Jungfrau von Orleans* und *Wilhelm Tell* wäre es nicht geworden, was es ist.' I think it is merely an incomplete enumeration of sources when the author omits to mention *die Räuber*. For Ehrhardt, while showing the relation between the two plays, says very truly (Biogr., p. 439): 'Grillparzer steht vollständig im Banne Schiller's und zwar des Verfassers *der Räuber*'.

One must find the beginning of Dr. Lessing's last chapter very surprising. '*Die Ahnfrau*,' so the Thesis reads (p. 186), 'verdankt ihre Entstehung weniger inneren Erfahrungen als unklaren Vorstellungen.' If one follows, for comparison, first Grillparzer's own testimony as to the disposition of his mind at that time (*Jahrb.* III. pp. 123-126; pp. 130-132), and then reads *die Ahnfrau*, he will discover in the latter all these well and clearly defined mental moods noted in the observations of the diary. Minor (*Jahrb.* IX.) and Dr. Kohm (*Jahrb.* XI.) take this fact for granted in their respective discussions. But, most of all, Grillparzer himself maintains very emphatically (Works, vol. 18, 173) that 'just these personal views and individual perceptions made his drama so effective.' Concerning the influence of Schiller upon *die Ahnfrau*, the author's view differs likewise from that of other interpreters of the drama. Verbal imitations and resemblances may not be so frequent as in *Blanka*, but a closer investigation forces one to believe that the influence is stronger than Dr.

Lessing admits. How much the poet owes, especially to *die Braut von Messina* and *die Räuber*, has been shown more than once by Minor, (*Jahrb.*, IX) Volkelt,<sup>1</sup> and others; it will therefore not be necessary to enter into any lengthy discussion of that question.

What Dr. Lessing expresses in a foot-note on p. 200 as his view of the value of *Sappho*, is, as he admits himself, somewhat startling, and one can only wish that he may prove his statement as soon as possible.—As said in the beginning, Dr. Lessing's interpretation of Grillparzer's dramas does not go beyond *Sappho*. The promised treatment of the whole subject will naturally furnish still more interesting material; for as every Grillparzer student will admit, the real value and profit of Schiller's influence upon the Austrian poet becomes evident only in his dramas after *Sappho*, for example, *Ottokar*, *Hero* and *Leander, der Bruderkwist*, and, to some extent also, in *Ein treuer Diener*.

A. BUSSE.

*Cambridge, Mass.*

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

##### PHONETIC RECORDS OF DIALECTS.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—Hardly any more important problem could be undertaken than that of collecting phonograms of the dialects of the world. All of them are rapidly changing and many are fast disappearing. They should be collected on indestructible material, such as hard rubber or celluloid, so that they can be duplicated by the thousand, used as often as desired, and traced off on paper for measurement.

Several arrangements for collecting dialects have already been made.

For America the following can be done. On proper application I can meet the person in Philadelphia and have a record made. Two matrices will be preserved, one to be deposited with me, the other at some place to be designated. These

<sup>1</sup> *Frans Grillparzer als Dichter des Tragischen*. Nördlingen, 1888.

matrices will be under my personal control and no use can be made of them without permission. Rubber impressions will be made and furnished through my secretary. A limited number of these will be distributed free to certain libraries and institutions; others can be obtained at cost. During the summer a car will be fitted with a gramophone laboratory; it will be run to any points designated and records can be made at thirty to forty miles from the railway. Matrices and records will be controlled as stated above. With still another method, graphophone cylinders and metal molds, a single operator can travel where he pleases. It would be highly desirable to formulate some plan for a phonetic survey of the United States. Such a survey would be something far more complete and detailed than Gilliéron's atlas for France or that for British India.

For foreign languages several things are possible. By an arrangement with H. Lioret, 12 rue Thibaud, Paris, anyone in Paris can, on my recommendation, have records made in celluloid at 2 frs. 50 each. These records can be traced off by my special machine (Elizabeth Thompson Science Fund) and the curves delivered to anyone competent to study them. As Paris contains all things, it would not be difficult to carry out a phonetic survey of France of this new kind. The cost would not be great.

Another means of getting records is to arrange with the traveling gramophone operators; one of these is now in Finland and another in British India. These men collect for commercial purposes and seldom include anything except music; I have no doubt that specimens of speech could be included and delivered free of charge.

Still another method is to use the Philadelphia laboratory by bringing immigrants to it.

The graphophone cylinders and metal molds can be advantageously used for foreign travel; a specially light machine can be furnished for the purpose.

As the result of work for the last six years, the methods of tracing and studying these speech records have been developed to a high degree of accuracy, and the above arrangements have been completed for collecting, preserving and studying all the languages. It is impossible to go further without co-operation. My tracing machines every

month grind off enough material for three large doctor-theses, and the material accumulates rapidly. These results must be placed in the hands of interested workers. At Yale I have only one special student, and his work has already been traced. I am now arranging to send a quantity of material to Germany. If there are in America persons with the enterprise and patience to work up records of American, English or French or any other language, they can be furnished with the tracings free of charge and the cost of publication will be attended to.

E. W. SCRIPTURE.

*Yale University.*

---

*To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.*

SIRS:—There was some discussion in your columns last year (Jan., Feb., April) on the question of teaching the English-speaking student how to pronounce the German *ch* sound; as, in *ich*, *Berg*, etc. One writer suggested proceeding from the initial sound of English *hew*, *here*, *humane*, but this method is vitiated at least by the fact that the sound referred to as being similar to the German *ch* in *ich* is certainly not uniformly found in English pronunciation. I myself have observed it only occasionally, and then only in very emphatic utterance. A second writer proposed to require the learner to bring the tip of the tongue from the position of *sh* in *she* to the back of the lower teeth, a process which he characterized as "rather awkward." In fact, the adjustment of the tongue required in passing from the position of one sound to that of another of an entirely different class is so considerable as to be, I should think, quite beyond the skill of many beginners.

Would not the simplest method be to proceed from the sound requiring a practically identical tongue position, namely, the corresponding voiced sound of *j* in *ja*, or its English analogue *y* in *yes?* This sound can be prolonged at will, the tongue position being readily maintained by the learner. A little exercise in alternating the voiced and the voiceless sound, under the direction of the teacher, results in a mastery of the difficulty, as I can testify from experience.

W. H. FRASER.

*University of Toronto.*

*To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.*

SIRS:—Referring to the review of my edition of *Le Petit Chose* in the MOD. LANG. NOTES for December, I desire to say, in the first place, that I am greatly indebted to Professor François for pointing out the errors in my book. They will be corrected at the first opportunity. There are a few points, however, where it seems to me there is room for a difference of opinion and to these I propose to call attention.

To the objection that my introduction is insufficient for college students, I would reply that it was not my purpose to write a biography or a critical study of Daudet. This would have been out of place in an unpretentious little book like mine. Besides, the college student is supposed to have access to sources of information where he can learn more about Daudet than could be given even in a lengthy introduction. I also question the utility of reading much about an author before reading his works extensively.

Professor François disapproves of the hyphen in *chez-moi*, page 39, line 7, but the authorities seem to be against him. The Paris edition which I followed has the hyphen and this is also the spelling given by Littré, as well as by Sachsvillatte. I have before me now a book called "Journal d'un Curé de campagne," Paris, 1902, and on page 111, line 8, I read, "Que c'est bon, le chez-soi!"

*Nous montâmes*, page 68, line 30, sounds "strange" to Professor François, but it seems to be what Daudet wrote. At all events, the entire paragraph, beginning with line 29, is taken literally from a recent Paris edition. That the German edition was different here did not concern me.

Regarding the note on *plein*, page 51, I may say that authorities are not agreed as to what part of speech it is in this construction and there is good authority for calling it an adjective. It is so treated; for example, in Fraser and Squair's *Grammar*, page 254, and Bescherelle, in his dictionary, also calls it an adjective, while in the *Dictionnaire général* of Hatzfeld and Darmesteter it is treated as an adjective, substantive and adverb but not as a preposition. It is, therefore, a fair inference that it was not so regarded. There is also authority for calling *plein* in this construction an adverb of

quantity. True, Professor François has the authority of Littré on his side, but the point may well be regarded as unsettled, as will appear from what has been said above.

*Pain* in "painsome" is, of course, intended to be pronounced as a French word. It is impossible to indicate the proper pronunciation with English characters.

O. B. SUPER.

*Dickinson College.*

#### OLD FRENCH PARALLELS TO *Inf.* V. 127-138.

*To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.*

SIRS:—Van Hasselt has remarked<sup>1</sup> the parallel in Froissart<sup>2</sup> to the love scene, *Inf.* v. 127-138. The lines will bear repetition:

Droitement sus l'eure de prime  
S'esbatoit une damoisele  
A lire un rommant. Moi vers ele  
M'en vinc, et li dis doucement  
Par son nom: "Ce rommant, comment  
L'appelés-vous, ma belle et douce?"  
Ele cloï autant la bouce;  
Sa main dessus le livre adoise.  
Lors respont comme courtoise  
Et me dist: "De Cléomadès."  
.....  
Et quant ele ot lit une espasce  
Elle me requist par sa grase  
Que je vosisse un petit lire.  
.....  
Adont lisi tant seulement  
Des feuilles, ne scai deus ou trois.  
.....  
Adont leissames nous le lire.

Apparently it has not been observed that before as well as after Dante similar parallels are to be found in Old French literature. In each of these foreshadowings the treatment is frivolous; but the merest hint would have been sufficient.

*Floire et Blanceflor*,<sup>3</sup> a poem of the twelfth

<sup>1</sup> *Li Roumans de Cléomadès*, p. p. A. Van Hasselt. Bruxelles, 1865, p. xxvi.

<sup>2</sup> *Oeuvres de Froissart: Poésies*, p. p. Aug. Scheler. Bruxelles, 1870, pp. 107-108.

<sup>3</sup> *Floire et Blanceflor*, p. p. Édélestand du Méril. Paris, 1856. Bibl. Elzévirienne.

century,<sup>4</sup> recounts among other things the early loves of two young persons whose reading makes them the more susceptible :

Livres lissoient païenors  
Ou oient parler d'amors;  
En cou forment se delitoient,  
Es euvres d'amor qu'il trovoient  
Cil livres les fist moult haster.  
(p. 11.)

*Floris et Liriope*<sup>5</sup> is assigned approximately to the year 1250.<sup>6</sup> Floris, a vassal's son, is enamored of Liriope, daughter of an emperor. Disguised in his sister's clothes, Floris takes his sister's place as companion to the princess :

Ce fu en mai, ou tens serain,  
Les .ii. compagnies main a main  
S'asirent sous .i. olivier.  
Biaus fu li leus por soulacier;  
Desous vers, desoure floris.  
.  
.i. romans aportei avoient  
Qu'eles mout volentiers lissoient.  
Por ce tous d'amors estoit;  
Et au comencement avoit  
Coment Piramus et Thysbe  
Furent de Babiloine nei,  
Coment li enfant c'entramerent.  
.  
Qant ont ceste aventure lite,  
Floris, cui ele mout delite,  
Dist : " Dame, certes, se i'estoie  
Piramus, ie vos ameroie.  
.  
Or me dites vostre pense."  
" Ne sai," fait ele, " Ke i'en die."  
.  
Del sorplus riens ne vos dirai  
Car nule veritei n'en sai.  
(ll. 955-1045).

The pitfalls of this mode of presentation may have suggested letting Francesca tell her own story.

ALFRED J. MORRISON.

Johns Hopkins University.

<sup>4</sup> Gröber: *Grundriss*, II, 1, p. 527.

<sup>5</sup> *Floris et Liriope*, herausgeg. von Wolfram von Zingerle. Leipzig, 1891.

<sup>6</sup> Gröber: *Grundriss*, II, 1, pp. 832-833.

#### THE AUTHOR OF *La Spagna*.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—In speaking of the fourteenth century romantic epic, *La Spagna*, Ginguené, (*Histoire de la littérature d'Italie*, vol. IV, p. 201) says, after quoting the lines in which the author announces himself,

A voi "signor ho rimato tuttō questo  
Sostegno di Zanobi da Fiorenza."

"mais on n'en est pas plus avancé, car l'on ne trouve nulle part rien qui nous puisse apprendre ce que c'était que ce rimeur florentin."

Recently, in looking over some scattered portions of the *Libro del Monte del Comune di Frenze*, belonging to the Plimpton Collection, I came across the following items :

Nofri di Giovanni pagò per se e per fratelli ad(i) 10 d(i) Settembre f(io)r(ini) trenta

Ad(i) VII gennaio 1397 Il sopraddettonofri permuto la sopraddetta p(ar)tita di fiorini trenta doro evolle sponessono aragione di M(adonn)a pagola don(n)a fu d(i) Sostegno d(i) Zanobi, Q(uar)t(ier)e di S(an) G(iovanni) colle paghe E p(er)ò qui cancellato p(er) me pagolo not(aio)accio diputato Imperoche posto i(n) questo registro innanzi a 245.

Likewise, Piero di Falco pays over to the same Paola's account on Dec. 8th, 1397 eighty gold florins, of course, for value received.

In consideration of the fact that the poem belongs to the second half of the fourteenth century : that Sostegno is a most uncommon first name, that the father's name, in each case, is Zanobi ; and that it is improbable that Paola could have been a widow more than fifty years, I think that we may establish the identity of the poet without a doubt, as well as the following facts :

Sostegno di Zanobi was not living in 1397 but he left a widow Paola who, in that year, was living in the Quartiere of San Giovanni in possession of the comfortable sum of 110 fls. (about \$250, with the purchasing value of about \$875) an offset to her husband's statement in *La Spagna* :

Che or vi piaccion alquanto por la mano  
A vostre borse e farmi dono alquanto  
Che qui ho già finito il quinto canto.

MARGARET H. JACKSON.

Wellesley College.

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.

SIRS:—In the January number of the *Notes*, page 27, Professor Geddes refers to "Professor Hempl's series of *Ideophonic Texts*." This implies an error. The series referred to is that of Mr. Robert Morris Pierce. The pedagogical ideas upon which the series is based are his, not mine, though I am in part responsible for the execution of the Tell volume. My position as to the teaching of foreign languages may be seen in the Introduction to *The Easiest German Reading* (Ginn and Co.) and in my forthcoming *German Grammar*. In the latter book I have also presented the modification that I advocate of the alphabet of the International Phonetic Association.

GEORGE HEMPL.

*University of Michigan.*

#### BRIEF MENTION.

*A Student's History of English Literature.* By WILLIAM EDWARD SIMONDS, Ph. D. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

It is probably impossible to produce a perfectly satisfactory manual of English Literature. The compiler of such a work—unless he aims at nothing higher than a mere cram-book of names and dates—has four elements to deal with: the character and tendencies of the time; accounts of individual authors and works; critical estimates; and illustrative excerpts. It is not possible to treat all these adequately in the limits of a text-book; so every compiler must frame an equation for himself, and determine, according to his tastes and judgment, what he will insert and what omit.

Dr. Simonds has adjusted this equation in a fairly satisfactory manner: the characteristics of the times and leading lines of drift in thought and action are noted, and the critical remarks are clear and just. If some of the biographical sketches seem meagre, and illustrative extracts too few, we must bear in mind the necessary limitations of a manual of this kind. The "suggestions for study" are excellent.

A few minor inaccuracies may be passed over as

unimportant; but the student should not be told that Burke "was raised to the peerage as Earl of Beaconsfield."

A few years ago (Dec., 1897) the Northwestern University acquired a valuable collection of German classics, gathered by the late Geheimrat Schneider, a member of the local government in Schleswig. Professor James T. Hatfield, to whose initiative and zeal the acquisition of this treasure for the Library of the Northwestern University is principally due, has just published in *The Book-Lover*, Vol. III, No. 6 (January-February, 1903), pp. 485–490, an interesting article, giving a brief account of the collection and illustrating by a few typical examples its usefulness for the study of German literature. The library contains some two thousand seven hundred volumes and consists almost entirely of original editions of German authors, from the time of the Reformation down to the latter half of the nineteenth century. The classics of the eighteenth century are especially well represented, and in Professor Hatfield's article a prominent place is naturally given to the works of Goethe, Schiller, and Lessing. We learn that not only such rare books as the first editions of Goethe's *Werther*, *Iphigenie*, and *Hermann und Dorothea*, or Schiller's *Anthologie* and *Die Räuber* are included in the collection, but also important periodicals like the *Thalia* and *Die Horen*. The library, moreover, contains one of the most complete collections of "poetical almanacs" (*Musenalmanache*); for example, complete sets of the Göttingen, Leipzig, and Berlin series.

#### PERSONAL.

Professor F. J. A. Davidson, who was Assistant Professor of Romance Languages at Leland Stanford University from 1895 to 1900, and in 1900–1901 Professor of Romance Languages at the University of Cincinnati, is now special lecturer on Spanish at the University of Toronto. His resignation of the chair of Romance Languages at Cincinnati was occasioned by the death of his father, the administration of whose estate necessitates Dr. Davidson's residence in Toronto.